

BOSTON REVIEW.

VOL. IV.—JANUARY, 1864.—No. 19.

ARTICLE I.

THE TRINITY.

"THERE are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory." *Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism.*

THE doctrine which this article sums up and condenses from the Scriptures, is peculiarly a Scripture doctrine. Like the doctrine of the atonement, it is not likely to be discovered from nature, but requires to be revealed. The mode of the divine existence is, from the nature of the subject, so high above all the analogies of nature or created existences, that we must depend wholly on the Bible for the statement and the proof. Nor can we reasonably expect to comprehend it fully in its philosophy. "Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" All that can be demanded by reason is that the facts be clearly revealed and that it shall not be absurd and impossible, or contradictory to reason and the analogy of nature. This therefore is one of several truths fundamental to the Gospel system, which no man can be expected to receive who has not first fully settled in his mind the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, such as to constitute them an infallible guide.

As evidence, however, that the doctrine is not contrary to reason, and that nature does not reject or cry out against it, it may be stated that, like the custom of sacrifices, the notion has been very prevalent through the world, that, in some way, the Deity has a three-fold manner of existence. This fact can only be accounted for on the supposition that the doctrine of the Trinity was revealed to the patriarchs, and, by tradition, some traces of it were preserved and spread abroad among the nations.

It is well known that the ancient Egyptians, and the eastern nations generally believed in a Trinity. The missionaries find the Hindoos believing it in modern times, and find them also tracing the notion back to a very ancient date.

As the philosophers thought it their province to explain every thing, we find Plato, nearly four hundred years before Christ, endeavoring by philosophy to bring down the mystery to the comprehension of men. He resolved the Trinity into, (1) God as pure reason. (2) God as the original ideas in reason. (3) Gods these ideas infused into material forms and now existing as the soul of the world. Plato had many followers who adopted these speculations with more or less addition and modification. During the first Christian century there arose various sects called Gnostics whose object was to blend the Platonic philosophy with the doctrines of the Gospel. The Ebionites, the Nicolaitans, and the followers of Cerinthus, against whom John wrote his Gospel, were all Gnostics who were corrupting this and other Christian doctrines by their speculations. Undoubtedly John in the latter part of his life wrote his Gospel more expressly to deny and refute the errors of those false teachers, who had endeavored to persuade the early Christians that the divine and the human were not actually and really united in the person of the Lord Jesus.

Hence at the outset, he goes back to the very expression which the Jewish church had for ages employed to represent the Jehovah, or Lord of the Old Testament, and repeatedly, and unequivocally applies it to Christ; declaring that this same person, called by the patriarchs and prophets the Angel Jehovah, "The Lord whom ye seek," "the messenger of the covenant," was the Lord Jesus Christ, both their Creator and Redeemer. The Babylonian paraphrase, or Targum, frequently translates the Hebrew word "Jehovah," by "The *Word* of the Lord."

John therefore seizes on this expression, well understood by the Jews, and the strongest he could employ to affirm that Jesus Christ is the very God whom the patriarchs and prophets worshipped from the beginning. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by him. And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory (i. e. we, like our fathers, beheld his shekinah) the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

This authoritatively settled the question. Accordingly we find that, during the first three centuries, the primitive preachers of the Gospel taught the doctrine of the Trinity in the most plain and simple form, stating and affirming it without attempting any explanation. But, towards the close of this period, many who had imbibed the doctrines of the Gnostics were nominally converted to Christianity; and by them a new attempt was made to blend the two; or rather by philosophy to reduce the deep mystery of the mode of Triunity to the comprehension of reason.

With them the theory of emanation was the great source of explanation. The second person was viewed as an emanation from the first; and the third evolved by conjoined emanation from both the first and second. Construing the words of Jesus, "I came out from God," as if spoken of the literal generation of the Son, they said, it follows that the Son was begotten from the being of the Father. This gross view presented the Father and the Son as corporeal; and the Father as divided into two. Well has it been said, "these are the dogmas of men who never even dreamed of an invisible, incorporeal nature." Yet they served to bring on, in the fourth century, the most ardent and metaphysical discussion which the church has ever known. On one side the distinction between the Father and the Son was made so broad that the Son became wholly a distinct being from, and inferior to the Father: this was the Arian heresy. On the other hand, the distinction was so little that the Father and the Son became both wholly the same, only under different forms of manifestation. This was the Sabellian heresy.

All this shows us that the true doctrine of the Trinity, while

it must be received as a fact of revelation, is not, and was never felt to be absurd or impossible. It is not contradictory to reason, but above reason, like a thousand other things which have not been as to manner yet fully revealed and unfolded.

Before proceeding to the direct Scripture proof of this doctrine, it is important that we get the clearest possible view of precisely what is affirmed. It is not meant that there is simply a distinction of divine attributes, as if power stands for the Father; wisdom for the Son; and truth for the Spirit. Nor is a distinction founded on relations what is meant by the Trinity; as if God were called Father in consequence of his relation as creator and preserver. It is not the result of different manifestations, as if God as manifest to the patriarchs was the Father; and the same personality as manifest in the flesh was the Son; and as manifest on the day of pentecost, the Spirit. But it is meant that, independently of all manifestations and relations, there is in the eternal nature of the Deity a three-fold distinction to such an extent as that there can be proper society and communication between them. This three-fold distinction, for want of a better term, is commonly called a personal distinction.

Again, it is not, as we be slanderously reported, that we believe the one God to be three Gods; or the three Gods one God, but that the mode of his infinite and indefinable existence is that of a triunity; that the one God exists in three separate and distinct persons; that he is one in substance or being, and three in personality; that there is a basis in the high and mysterious nature of God's one only being, which renders it possible and natural that his personality should be three-fold.

This can not be said to be contradictory, without asserting the identity and inseparability of substance and personality; and no one is prepared for that; for substance is defined to be, "The essential part, that which supports accidents." Substance may exist without personality.

If you ask how the one being of God can exist in persons, we can not tell. Neither can we tell how man exists as soul and body, two distinct natures in one person. Indeed the mode in which any being subsists, connecting its distinct nature and known properties, is a mystery to the most learned naturalists,

and probably always will be in this world. And if the most common of God's works, with which we are so conversant, be in this respect incomprehensible, how can men think that the mode of the existence of the infinite Creator should be level to their capacities?

Looking now to the proofs, we shall find it most natural to divide our subject into two parts.

First, God is revealed in the Scriptures as the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. In the following passages, the three are placed in marked distinction from each other and all upon the same divine basis.

"Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Matt. xxviii. 19. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." 2 Cor. xiii. 14. "The Lord [evidently the Holy Ghost] direct your hearts into the love of God, [God the Father,] and into the patient waiting for Christ." 2 Thes. iii. 5. "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." 1 Peter i. 2.

Other passages might be adduced in which the three persons in the Trinity address each other, enter into covenant engagements with each other, and in various ways are distinguished into different personalities.

That these three are the one only God is abundantly taught from texts which exclude all other Gods, such as—

"Is there a God beside me? Yea, there is no God; I know not any." Isa. xlv. 8. "See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no god with me: I kill and I make alive; I wound and I heal: neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand. For I lift my hand to heaven and say, I live forever." Deut. xxxii. 39, 40. "Thou art God alone." Ps. lxxxvi. 10.

Second, these three persons are revealed in the Scriptures as equal in all divine attributes. It will not be necessary to enumerate the proofs that all divine attributes and titles are ascribed to God the Father; since as creator and governor this is everywhere seen and admitted. Our remaining work is, therefore, to

produce the evidences that such is the case also in relation to the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

It is necessary, however, first to premise that there can be no middle ground between God and a created being. From the nature of the case there can be no degrees in divine nature, since the very idea of divinity is infinite completeness, the highest possible state of being. The gulf between the creature and the Creator is an absolutely impassable and boundless one. There may be different orders of angels, rising rank above rank in the scale of being. But the highest, the archangel, is no more divine, no nearer to God in his real nature than the lowest. He is still a creature, and the distance between the creature and the Creator is and must be infinite. To suppose the contrary is to confound all distinctions of thought and language and render reasoning and knowledge as impossible as was society to the builders of Babel.

If, therefore, we find in the Scriptures that Christ and the Holy Ghost are spoken of in a way which raises them above the rank of creatures; if the divine, incommunicable attributes, such as eternity, self-existence, creative power, and omniscience are attributed to them; if a religious reverence is required to be paid to them, and sentiments and feelings are expressed towards them such as are only proper to be given to God; we must regard them as supremely Divine.

Let us come now to the view which the Bible presents of the Lord Jesus Christ. And at the outset it is essential to meet and answer satisfactorily the objections to the divine character of Christ which arise from apparently opposing texts, such as,

"The Son can do nothing of himself." John v. 19. "My Father is greater than I." John xiv. 28. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father." John vi. 57. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." John i. 18.

Now in relation to these and all similar passages, two considerations furnish a complete answer.

First. The Son of God was truly and completely human as well as divine; and of course we expect the Scriptures to affirm

his humanity and in various ways recognize it. It was as important to his work of atonement that he should be human as that he should be divine. To be a proper daysman or mediator between God and man, he must partake of the nature of both. The idea of God, suffering as God, is revolting to our feelings, if not absurd. We see not how the whole Godhead could leave the throne of government and majesty even for a moment, and trail his royal robes in dust and ignominy in order to make atonement. It requires three persons, if one is to be the mediator between two.

And on the other hand, if we regard Christ as only the manifestation of God, and not a real person, then the suffering and atonement was only a pretense on the part of God and not real; which is utterly untenable and revolting. Christ must have had therefore a human body and soul as real, and in every respect like our own. His human body was as dependent on God for strength as any other human body; and his human mind and soul as dependent on God for sympathy, knowledge and wisdom as that of any other human mind and soul. And if this his humanity was essential to his character and work as redeemer, we see not how the Bible could be expected to be silent or equivocal on this subject. Hence the Scriptures are explicit and full in bringing out the distinct and perfect humanity of the Lord Jesus. It is said,

“He increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man.” “The word was made flesh and dwelt among us.” “There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.” “Verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham: wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren.”

The other consideration is, that the Son of God for a time assumed, as was necessary to his redeeming work, a place subordinate to that of the Father, the place of an obedient, faithful, loving, and suffering son and servant. Both Isaiah and the Psalmist plainly intimate that, far back in the councils of eternity, the Three in One entered into covenant in relation to human redemption, in which the Son engages to take upon him the form of a servant and make atonement, and the Father en-

gages that if the Son shall make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied. Accordingly Paul says of Jesus :

“Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God : but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of men : and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name ; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth ; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.” Phil. ii. 6—11.

Now with these two considerations in our mind the whole Bible harmonizes with the claim to supreme divinity which the Son of God himself set up and frequently advocated. Not a text can be found which asserts the humanity, the dependence, or subordination of Christ, in contradiction to his divinity. In every instance the text and context may be naturally made to harmonize with all these numerous passages which unequivocally assert the supreme divinity of the Saviour.

It is only necessary to add a few of these passages. In the following passages in John, Christ claims equality and unity with God.

“My Father worketh hitherto and I work. Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also, that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.” John v. 17, 18.

And notwithstanding this accusation, Jesus continued to call God his Father more than fifty times as recorded by the evangelists.

“I and my Father are one.” John x. 30. “The Jews answered him, saying : For a good work we stone thee not ; but for blasphemy, and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.” John x. 33. “Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemist ; because I said I am the Son of God?” John x. 36. “If I do not the work of my Father, believe me not.” John x. 37. “O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.” John xvii. 5.

In the following passages is collected a specimen of the titles given to Christ in the Scriptures.

"I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last." Rev. xxii. 13. "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulders: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." Isa. ix. 6. "And we are in him that is true, even in his son Jesus Christ: this is the true God and eternal life." 1 John v. 20. "Lord of all." Acts x. 36. "Lord of lords." Rev. xvii. 14. "It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell." Col. i. 19. And again, "Ye are complete in him who is the head of all principality and power." Col. ii. 10.

In Heb. xiii. 8, immutability is ascribed to him: "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever."

In Col. i. 16, he is recognized as the creator and as having the right to seek his own glory. "All things were created by him and for him."

John i. 3, asserts his omnipotence:

"All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." Also his eternity: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God."

In the following text from Col. i. 16, 17, both his omnipotence and his eternity are asserted:

"By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities or powers. All things were created by him and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist."

Here is omnipresence:

"Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Matt. xviii. 20. "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Matt. xxviii. 20.

While he is yet on earth he asserts that he is in heaven.

"No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven." John iii. 13.

He wrought miracles in his own name and by his own direct power, saying, Matt. viii. 3, "I will, be thou clean," while the apostles uniformly wrought in the name of Christ.

We shall only add that the honors of supreme adoration were everywhere claimed for him and given to him. The martyr Stephen died, Acts vii. 59, "Calling upon God and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Christ never forbade those who fell down before him and worshipped him. Now to worship any being but God was strictly forbidden. Jesus said to Satan, Matt. iv. 10, "It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." In Col. ii. 18, "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels." If it be said that Christ received worship in the name of, and as the representative of God, it is replied, why then could not the apostles and the angels do the same? But they always refused and shrunk back with horror from the idea. When on one occasion, Acts xiv. 11—15, the Lycaonians with their priests of Jupiter brought oxen and garlands, and would have done sacrifice to Paul and Barnabas, the apostles hearing of it,

"Rent their clothes and ran in among the people, crying out, and saying; sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you, that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein."

John also tells us in Rev. xix. 10, that when he fell down to worship the angel which had showed him the wonders that he records, probably supposing him to be God, the angel said unto him, "see thou do it not; for I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of those who keep the sayings of this book: worship God." How very different from all this was it with the Lord Jesus Christ! When he commissioned the apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature, he required them to associate his name with that of the Father and the Holy Ghost, in the baptismal formula. This would have been the highest conceivable blasphemy had he been anything short of the eternal, self-existent God.

The apostles ascribed to him the highest form of worship in their benedictions: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the

love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen." Their most common benediction was, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you." Peter has it, 2 Peter, iii. 18, "But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; to him be glory both now and forever. Amen." Jude closes with, "To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and forever. Amen."

What blasphemy all this, on the supposition even that Jesus was but the highest seraph that ever tuned his golden harp in glory!

In Hebrews we are taught that God the Father requires that the Son should receive worship; "When he bringeth the first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him." Heb. i. 6. In Rev. v. 13, we are told that all the glorified inhabitants were heard saying, "Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever."

We have thus shown, we think, beyond all dispute, that the Scriptures uniformly represent Christ Jesus as equal with the Father in all divine attributes.

How is it with reference to the Holy Ghost, the third person in the Godhead?

We do not know that either his personality or his divine nature were ever disputed by the Jews. Hence, less pains were taken by the evangelists and apostles to affirm and establish the same. But having such indubitable evidence in relation to the supreme divinity of the Son, the inference is natural and strong that the same is true of the Holy Ghost. The principle of plurality of persons being admitted, and there being the same necessity for distinct, personal, and divine existence in the office-work of the Holy Spirit, as in the case of the Lord Jesus; the evidence of the supreme divinity of the Holy Spirit is readily received. The office-work of the Holy Spirit in the scheme of redemption is as important as the office-work of the Son of God. Men must be convicted, illuminated, regenerated, sanctified; and so reconciled to God. If the Father could consistently reconcile sinners to himself, why could he not redeem them also? If certain subjects were in unreasonable and wicked

rebellion against their king, it would not be considered consistent with the proper honor and majesty of the government to plead with the rebels, or even to communicate with them while they were in rebellion. A neighboring sovereign might volunteer to change and bring back the rebels to their allegiance, and thus it would be consistent for the justly offended king to delay retribution and give space for repentance.

So in the government of God over rebellious and lost men, there is seen to be need of a distinct, divine person to take into his hands the work of actually renewing and reconciling men to God on the plan provided by Christ; one who shall take of the things of Christ and show them unto sinners; one who shall, by inspiration, provide a Bible, the truth, by means of which to enlighten and sanctify; one who shall set home the Law, in its spiritual interpretation, upon the conscience, touching and subduing the flinty heart, with the same efficient, almighty power by which a dead body is raised to life, as Paul teaches in the first chapter of Ephesians; one who shall be the guide and comforter of Christians, always with them after Christ's departure.

Such was the teaching of Christ in his farewell address to his disciples.

"But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things." "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment."

This language can only have any meaning on the supposition that the Holy Spirit is truly a divine and personal agent. Accordingly in the following passages, the Holy Ghost is called God more or less directly. "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." Acts v. 3, 4. Let it be remembered that the Holy Ghost, as did Christ before him, had made his official entrance into the world just before, on the day of Pentecost, to be henceforth the divine, official guide of the apostles and the church. And that men might be impressed with a sense of his true character; might be warned not to trifle with him on whom their conversion and sealing depended, it was important thus

early and awfully to vindicate him as the heart searcher, against the slight of Ananias and Sapphira.

Again, if we put together these two passages, John iii. 5 and John i. 13, the declaration of the Spirit's divinity, and of his attribute of power is as plain as language can make it. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God." "Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." So also in the following texts, one asserts that inspiration is of God; and the other attributes it to the Holy Ghost. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." 2 Tim. iii. 16. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Peter i. 21. Again, compare 1 Cor. iii. 16 with 1 Cor. vi. 19. "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" "What! know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?"

The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is made an unpardonable sin. Is this done to secure divine honor to, and fear for, the Holy Ghost? In Heb. ix. 14, he is called the "Eternal Spirit." In other passages he is called the Spirit of wisdom and knowledge, the Spirit of power, the Spirit of holiness. And there is no essential attribute or work of divinity that is not repeatedly ascribed to him personally. He is one of the three that bear record in heaven. He is associated on equality with the Father and the Son in the baptismal formula; and prayer is offered to him in the apostolic benedictions and is intended to be thus offered in all ages. What evidence could we have more?*

Does any one ask for the use of the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity? Why all this pains to fathom so deep and mysterious a subject? The reply is at hand. While we would not seek to penetrate within the veil of unrevealed mystery, we must remember that the great facts concerning the mode of the divine existence are plainly revealed, and are of the highest importance for us to understand.

How shall we worship God "in spirit and in truth" if we have no correct knowledge of God? Without this piety can not

* We have formerly unfolded the proofs of the personality of the Holy Spirit, as an individual distinct from the Father and the Son, without regard to the question of his grade or divinity. See Vol. III., pp. 437-445.

be intelligent—it can only be a sentiment, like idolatry, though the idol be a god of the imagination. Did not Jesus teach that it is the will of the Father "That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father"? And, "He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father that hath sent him."

And are we not exhorted by the apostle, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption"? "Quench not the Spirit"? Are we not required to "love in deed and in truth," and that "hereby we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him"? How shall we avoid grieving him, if we neglect to know and honor him in his true character? How can we understand the plan of redemption, indeed how can we see it possible that there should be a real atonement, anything besides a mere pretence on the part of God, only as we are satisfied of the triune existence of the Divine Being?

Moreover, do we not get higher and more glorious conceptions of God, as being complete in himself, not solitary and silent, but having blissful and eternal society in himself, ages before he had created man, or the world, or any angel; one in nature, one in disposition, one in purposes, yet taking sweet council, planning harmoniously systems of worlds, and covenanting with unfaltering confidence?

What a cluster of infinite perfections and sources of blessedness is here; worthy of our contemplation and study throughout the ceaseless future: possessed of all conceivable sources of felicity, had no planets ever rolled from his hand to pursue their fixed undeviating orbits in space; and had no ranks of seraphim and cherubim been called into being to take their willing stations around his throne!

Can this doctrine ever be safely removed from our church creeds?

ARTICLE II.

HEROD THE GREAT.

HEROD THE GREAT was one of those unusual persons, whose life constitutes an era in history. Men reckon to and from such a life as a bold way mark on the great historical thoroughfare of events. Such was the cruelty of his character and government that he has become a byword and an illustration for all that is bloody in a man, and despotic in a king. The awful tragedy, that associates his name in the Gospel narrative with the Prince of Peace and the angel song of good will to men, is but an ordinary item in his monstrous life of nearly half a century as governor and king in the Holy Land.

It will much aid our understanding of the whole, if, before we go into the particulars of his life, we state who were prominent actors in the royal theatre of the East, and what was done by them in those times when Herod was so conspicuous.

Herod the Great was born in the year 72 B.C., and died in or near to the second year after the birth of Christ. Within these years of the lifetime of one king, many distinguished persons flourished in the East, and with them Herod, as a most prominent man, had both acquaintance and business.

Julius Caesar was older than Herod by only about twenty-five years, and so the two were for some years plundering the world at the same time. In the earlier part of his public career Pompey and Marius, Sylla and Cataline were vexing the Roman empire with their ambitious intrigues. Later in the reign of Herod, Antony and Cleopatra taxed the honor and peace of two kingdoms for their own mutual and criminal pleasures. The great Augustus, too, was nursing the army and navy of Rome for universal empire, while his patronage of literature was marking his reign as the Augustan and crowning age of Roman scholarship. These were the days of Cicero and Virgil, of Horace, Sallust and Livy. Most stirring battles and other events that shaped the courses of nations took place during the life of Herod. Caesar conquers Gaul and invades

Britain. The battle of Pharsalia is fought, leaving Caesar victor, and hurrying Pompey into Egypt to die by assassination. Four years afterward Caesar meets the same fate. Between these two violent deaths Herod receives his first appointment as governor of Galilee. Soon after followed the battle of Actium, that left Augustus without a rival, as head of the Roman empire.

In such times as these, among such men, and in scenes so important for the destinies of the world, was the life of Herod the Great.

The father of Herod was Antipater, an Idumean, or Edomite, of noble rank, and his mother, Cyprus, was an Arabian of illustrious family. When Herod was born Judæa was free, and the high priest was head both of church and state. For this office there was much intrigue, bribery and bloodshedding. When Herod was yet in his cradle, two brothers, Aristobulus and Hyrcanus, were competitors for the princely and priestly office. In the year 63 B.C. the victorious Pompey came to Damascus, as about to wage war on the Arabians. These two brothers submitted their case to him for arbitration. He decided in favor of Hyrcanus the elder. Aristobulus opposed the decision and shut himself up in Jerusalem with his faction, to carry the day against his brother and Pompey. The siege lasted three months, when the city was taken. In this capture of Jerusalem the walls of the temple and of the city suffered very much. After the capture Pompey gave to Hyrcanus full possession in the priesthood and princely office, and at the same time he made Judæa tributary to Rome.

In this position essentially the religious and civil state of things in Judæa continued till the sixteenth year of the reign of Hyrcanus. In this year, that is, 48 B.C., the battle of Pharsalia was fought between Julius Caesar and Pompey. Caesar was victor. Then came a change of administration in Judæa. Caesar continued Hyrcanus in the office of high priest, but cut off from him all civil power, drew a distinct line between church and state administration, and gave all the latter into the hands of Antipater, the father of Herod.

This Antipater was a man of extraordinary powers in civil affairs, and he had gained such an influence in Judæa, Syria

and Arabia that Caesar found it both politic and necessary to be on the best terms with him. And so he appointed him governor of Judæa under him. Antipater had five children; four sons, Herod, Phasælus, Joseph, Pheroras, and one daughter, Salome. Prideaux, An. 47. Immediately on receiving the appointment as procurator of Judæa he divided the civil power in it between his two sons, Pharsælus and Herod. To the former he gave Jerusalem and the regions adjoining, while he made Herod governor of Galilee. In this act Herod is first introduced to our notice as a public man. This was in the year 47 B.C., and when Herod was twenty-five years of age. For nearly half a century onward from this time he was a prominent actor in the stirring and tragic scenes of the East. All the wide region from the Nile to the Tiber, and in some measure, Germany, Gaul and Spain, felt his influence.

So soon as Herod entered on his office of governor he signalized it, and gave an index to his own character by destroying the robbers that infested Galilee and Cælo-Syria. There were strong and savage bands of these. But Herod soon made them captives, and in a very summary way, without any of the forms of a trial, he put them all to death. His enemies seized on this act as illegal, and foreshadowing tyranny and despotism. By their management he was summoned before the Sanhedrim, or Supreme Court of the Jews at Jerusalem. In his appearance at court he showed the same courage and independence that he had used in slaying the robbers. For he came, not as a criminal, but in royal robes, and with a well armed body-guard. His robes and soldiers and haughty bearing so overawed the court that no one of his former accusers dared bring any charge against him. At length one of the council, Sameas, boldly accused him, and upbraided the court for their timidity. When Hyrcanus, the high priest, who presided, saw that the judges would condemn him to death, he adjourned the trial till the next day, and in the meantime advised Herod to flee, which he did. So this man of violence opened his public career with an illegal execution of criminals, and then openly trampled on the regular administration of justice by defying and despising the highest judicature of the land, when assembled to try him.*

* Josephus' *Antiqs.* B. 14, c. 9. Prideaux' *Con. Anno* 47.

But by destroying the robbers he made himself very popular in Cœlo-Syria, the military presidency of which he soon after obtained by a heavy bribe. Now raising an army he was about to march on Jerusalem and punish Hyrcanus and the Sanhedrim for arresting and trying him. But his father and his brother Phasælus dissuaded him, though he had gone far enough to show his spirit and power.

As showing the temper of the age it may here be said that about this time, Antipater, the father of Herod, was poisoned at a feast by one who wished to work a revolution and come into power. Not long after Herod took care to have the assassin thrust through at another feast.

The enemies of Herod now hating him more than ever, and fearing that the Herodian family, now so successful and popular, would displace wholly the ancient family of the Maccabees or Asmonæans, they accused him and his brother to Mark Antony, then Roman governor in Asia. But by large presents Herod turned the judgment of Antony against his accusers, and obtained for himself and brother the office of tetrarch of the Holy Land. And when Antony would have put the accusers to death, Herod saved them by his intercessions.

The hostile party, not wearying in their efforts to destroy Herod, engaged the Parthians against him. When they had succeeded in imprisoning Hyrcanus the high priest and Phasælus, Herod fled with his household and friends, about eight hundred souls, and some treasure into Massada, a castle on the west shore of the Dead Sea. By this movement Antigonus, one of the Maccabees, became high priest. Phasælus, knowing that his death was determined, committed suicide by beating his head against the walls of his prison. Antigonus spared the life of Hyrcanus, but to prevent his ever returning to the office of high priest, through any change of mood with the people, he caused his ears to be cut off, thus making his restoration impossible. Lev. xxi. 17—21.

These were trying times for Herod, but instead of depressing him they roused his great powers to meet a great emergency. For leaving his family at Massada, in charge of his brother Joseph, with provision for a siege of several months, he led the remnant of his followers into Arabia, hoping for aid from Mal-

chus the king, whom he had often befriended. Malchus, like too many who are friends only in prosperity, refused a helping hand to the sinking fortunes of Herod. Without a pause Herod hastened to Egypt, and though it was the season of tempests and sailing was very dangerous, he embarked at Alexandria for Rome. On the way he was wrecked. Building another vessel he pressed on, arrived at Rome and laid his case before Antony. The Senate came together, and while Herod asked only that Aristobulus, his wife's brother, might be made high priest, and he rule under him, as his father Antipater had ruled under Hyrcanus, the Senate at once crowned him king of Judæa and Samaria and Idumæa, with the power of appointing whom he would as high priest, and all subordinate officers. Accomplishing all this in only seven days he left Rome for Judæa, and arrived after an absence of only three months.

But it was easier for the Roman Senate to vote the crown of Judæa to Herod than for Herod to wrest it from a rival and make it safe on his own head. The whole Roman force in Syria and the region around was ordered to aid Herod in this work, and it was commenced with all zeal. But Jerusalem was a strong city to be captured, and when the army went into winter quarters at the end of the first season, only the open country of Palestine and the minor strongholds had been brought over to the interest of Herod.

While the auxiliaries of the army rested through the winter, he with his men could not be quiet. A part of them he sent into Idumæa under his brother Joseph to make sure all his interest there. With the rest he undertook to destroy the bands of robbers in Galilee. These had their retreats in the caves that opened from the wild and perpendicular cliffs. To reach them Herod let down his soldiers from the tops of the precipices in huge boxes or baskets, till they came against the openings of their caves. Then with fire, and spears and long poles with hooks they managed to kill the robbers, or haul them out of their hiding places and tumble them down the rocks. Another summer campaign passed and still Antigonus held out in Jerusalem. But in the third year the Roman auxiliaries swelled the entire army to more than sixty thousand. With this force the city was closely beleaguered, and after a hard

siege of more than six months was taken. Antigonus was made a captive. He was one of the Asmonæan or Maccabæan family of kings. While he lived Herod could not therefore feel safe, and so by a great sum of money he persuaded Antony to put him to death. Thus Herod the Great became the actual and reigning king of Judæa, Samaria and Idumæa in the year 37 B.C., and in the thirty-fifth year of his age.

And now began to be revealed more fully the awful wickedness of this man. For while adversity will bring out a man's good qualities and show his greatness of mind, prosperity will expose his weaknesses and vices and moral deformities.

To be a king as Herod was, is to act as one pleases. This gives full liberty, a kind of unlimited and regal scope to selfishness and revenge and malice and mad ambition. So was it with Herod. He came to the throne through much blood, and by blood alone could he hold it. Though the opposing faction was subdued it was not extinct, and he was constantly tormented with a lively fear that some of them would seek his life in revenge or to restore the old Asmonæan dynasty. So he was daily putting some of them to death. His fears acted as witness, judge and jury against them. The Sanhedrim, who had tried him for his illegal execution of the robbers, he put to death wholly, excepting Pollio and Sameas. Through the entire siege they had counselled the Jews to yield to Herod. Sameas was the one who showed true manliness in accusing Herod when all others were silent and afraid. It would seem as if Herod respected such moral courage and independence, and rewarded it. He also put to death forty-five of the firmest friends of Antigonus. Of these cruelties there were holy witnesses, Zacharius and his wife Elizabeth, Anna the prophetess, and Simon the just, waiting to see our Lord that he might depart in peace.

The extreme selfishness and ambition of Herod are seen in his appointment of a high priest to fill the place of Hyrcanus now in exile. Anxious to keep from such a post of influence any one who could make himself prominent or important, Herod put into it an obscure and inferior man from among the captives at Babylon. This gave great trouble to Herod since it gave great offence to his own household. For he had married Ma-

riamne, the grand-daughter of Hyrcanus, and her brother, Aristobulus, by right of succession, was entitled to the priesthood. And Alexandra, the mother of his wife and of the young man, was constantly urging the claims of her son. She even began to enlist the aid of Cleopatra in securing the office for him. And so Herod unable to resist the importunities and intrigues of these women, deposed the Babylonian and installed Aristobulus in the office of high priest. But he was also the legal heir by succession to the crown, and having gained the former point, Alexandra, with a peculiar ambition and pride, set herself to secure the throne of Judæa for her son in place of her son-in-law, Herod.

Aristobulus also by his remarkable nobleness and beauty of personal appearance as a young man of seventeen had gained a dangerous popularity with the people while officiating as high priest. The quick eye of Herod saw that the youth, heir in the true line to both mitre and crown, and the only male member surviving of the Asmonean family, excepting his grandfather Hyrcanus, endangered his own popularity and even throne. He must be put out of the way. And so, while bathing at Jericho, his companions, as pre-arranged by Herod, dipped and ducked him, as if in sport, till he was drowned. Herod attempted to cover the crime by feigned tears and a splendid funeral and monument. But the veil was transparent to mother and sister and friends.

The mother sought revenge through Cleopatra, who persuaded Antony to call Herod to account for the death of Aristobulus. When Herod left Judæa to meet Antony in Syria he gave his government affairs and the charge of his family into the hands of his uncle Joseph. And doubting how it might fare with him, he charged his uncle to put Mariamne his wife to death, in case death should befall him. And this he did, he said, that no one, and especially the voluptuous Antony, might enjoy so rare a beauty as his wife after his decease.

This bloody command Joseph foolishly revealed to Mariamne. When Herod returned, his sister Salome, the very incarnation of jealousy and strife and domestic feuds, and between whom and his wife and mother-in-law there was perpetual hostility, persuaded him that Mariamne and his uncle had been too inti-

mate in his absence, and that she and her mother had been plotting escape from Jerusalem. Herod in his first passion was about to draw a dagger on his wife. But loving her very deeply he refrained, and spent his rage on his uncle and his wife's mother. The former he killed outright, and without hearing a word of defence, and the latter he put in chains and in prison.

But a course of crime and blood has no end except in reformation. Plotting and falsehood always demand one more step, to cover and make sure against the last. The policy of Herod gave him neither safety nor any resting place. Deeper depths opened before him, and crimes more revolting engaged his heart and hand.

The deposed high priest Hyrcanus, the grandfather of his wife Mariamne, still lived. For twenty-four years he filled the sacred office at the head of the Jewish nation. He was now a venerable old man of eighty, fast ripening for the grave. One would not think him a dangerous rival. But a guilty conscience is full of fears. He was the last surviving male member of the Maccabæan family. Herod wished to spill all the blood of that race except so much of it as was mingled with his own. And so, on some sham plot, invented for the occasion, he caused the old man to be tried, condemned and executed.

About this time, B.C. 31, Antony and Cesar Augustus, two rivals for the chief honor of the Roman Commonwealth, came to battle at Actium. Antony was routed and in the year following, his case being hopeless, he voluntarily fell on his sword and so died. Herod, who had been his ally against Augustus, now found it necessary to seek the favor of the latter. It was a dangerous and very doubtful step to show himself to Augustus. Yet with that adroitness and diplomacy, in which few have been his equals, he had the interview and came away with multiplied honors. When he left Judæa on this dangerous errand he left his wife Mariamne and her mother under charge of his treasurer, and confined to a castle, with the express command that if he met his death in this visit they should be immediately put to death. The women bore the imprisonment with great indignation, and when Herod returned, his wife, who had learned his command from her keeper, showed a bitter alienation from him. For more than a year this alienation continued. Mariamne

hated more and more her monster husband, while his sister and his mother, Cyprus, did all they could to inflame his jealousy, and bring him to put her to death. Nor did they labor in vain, and by judges of Herod's own choice, and by his strong personal effort at the trial, she was condemned to death, on a false charge of attempting to poison him.

So died a virtuous and excellent princess, and the ornament of her times. In the beauty and the graces of her person she excelled all the women of her day. Her feelings of estrangement from her husband were natural and excusable. He was building the fortunes of his family on the ruins of hers. He had usurped the crown that belonged to her race. To favor his own purposes and gratify his intense and unscrupulous ambition, he had brought to a violent death her father Alexander, her grandfather Hyrcanus, her brother Aristobulus, and her uncle Antigonus, her father's brother. And twice had he given conditional orders for her own death. Few women, whom the world could honor, would bear all this, and maintain an affection for such a monster, though he were a husband.

But Herod loved Mariamne intensely. Of the ten wives whom he had during his life, she was the noblest and the most beloved by him. It was only in passion and in burning jealousy, inflamed by his sister and mother, that he ordered her execution. So soon as the act was performed, his better sense and his affection for her returned. Then agony, regret, remorse, and every scathing passion preyed on him. He found no rest by day or night. Go where he would, her image haunted him. He plunged into pleasure of various kinds, but in vain. He was nearly delirious, and would in his frenzy, order his servants to call Mariamne. Then there came a pestilence on the land, and he received it as a judgment of God. He forsook Judaea and gave up all the business of his kingdom, and finally had a severe and very lingering sickness.

On his recovery he returned to Judaea, but he never recovered his former good spirits, and was more cruel than ever to the end of his life. In putting her to death he put out his guiding star. After this all was dark to him, and though he lived thirty years yet, his life settled into a deeper and deeper gloom, through more horrid crimes, till it ended in an awful night.

What a family scene have we here presented! It is a royal household, standing at the head of God's ancient and loved people. From it go forth law and example for the wide lands of Judæa, Samaria and Idumæa. Intrigue, bribery and violence have given this Herodian family their exalted position, at the sacrifice of the Maccabæan family, who had ruled the Jews for one hundred and twenty-nine years. A crown thus usurped gave an uneasy head to the usurper. If Herod could corrupt men to secure him this place, others could be corrupted to displace him. So anxieties, suspicions and jealousies were the constant companions of this miserable king. Unscrupulous, unjust and unmerciful himself, he was daily looking to see the same, in kind and measure, meted out to himself. And so, nominally a king, he was really a slave. His fancies and fears were a thousand keepers over him. A sense of his own injustice and of merited punishment led him to look for poison in every cup of cold water, and an assassin at any unguarded corner, in Jerusalem or Jericho, or Samaria, or in the stronghold of Masada, or the rock city of Petra. He had no kingdom. He was a prisoner at large, and his broad liberty to go where he would was his deep danger. In his very bed-chamber he looked to find his servant the hiding of some rival Maccabæan. So he sought to inclose and make himself safe by a fortification of tombs. He encircled himself with the graves of the Sanhedrim, and of the noble patrons of the Asmonean dynasty. He labored to protect himself from the royal line and the rivals of this line by building their sepulchres about him. If he would flee from care to his home, as to a strong tower, he had no home. This, as everything else that he touched, he had blighted. His shadow had fallen upon it, and it was dark. His breath was strange unto his wife, and she nobly refused his embrace and the hand that had twice drawn her death warrant.

And that God, whose judgments are strange and terrible in both worlds, might leave this man without guide or light to grope out his way of crime over the cliffs and into the awful chasm that awaited him, he suffered him, in a fit of jealousy and passion to put that noble woman to death. An eclipse then came over his sun that never passed off. So when Napoleon so basely disowned the noble Josephine. No battle, not even

Waterloo, so turned the day against him, as her divorce. It was the first step of the pathway that led him to his rock prison, around which the waves of the Atlantic kept an unceasing patrol, till death took guard of the prisoner.

The neglect and ill treatment of a good wife is one of those crimes that God follows up providentially with a close judgment. His own iniquities, as heaven's avenging police, seize the man in the guilty act, and bind him over to a daily chastisement in his own castle. If any man deserves a summary judgment, without trial or sympathy, it is that man who is cold and selfish and authoritative toward one whom he has vowed before heaven to love as himself. Why should his will or wish or self-indulgence take precedence and control in an interest that is mutual and inseparable? Why should he act the petty tyrant over one whom the law of God and man has given him as a mercy, to be evermore an undivided half of himself, and an equal heir to a common inheritance of joy? The neglect and abuse and tyrannies and slow agonies with which some men maltreat their wives, as if they were but a domestic convenience or utensil, though to the eye of the world all may seem fair, are crimes that God avenges. By a self-acting arrangement in the domestic system as God has constituted it, such men fall at once from the highest grade and blessedness of life. They hardly know why, but the ways are rough, the winds are adverse, times and moods and changes seem to come as a mishap. Their dull eye can see nothing of importance beyond the circle of self, nor any reason why all events should not revolve around their centre, and contribute to their happiness, and all wills and fancies yield to theirs. So to them the reason is unperceived why they are living a third and fourth rate life. And they do not account for the painfully realized fact that their existence is depreciating, and their life tending to a failure. God is visiting with judgment their abuse of an institution of his appointing, and of his preserving from the wreck of Eden. The coldness and selfishness and tyranny that the man bears toward her who is his equal in rank and superior in worth, is a violence done to himself. And while it falls primarily on the womanly and nobler half of the household head, it recoils like a divine visitation on the man as separate from the husband.

So Herod found it after he had put Mariamne to death. His palace was now as the house of a stranger to him. In his unfounded jealousy and violence he had made it desolate. Remorse and grief overcame him, and in his partial delirium he would call that loved name, and the echo through the gloomy halls would mock him. Visions of the murdered old man Hyrcanus flitted about, the cries of the drowning boy Aristobulus came over the stillness of his night watches.

The families nearest related to him by birth or marriage he had clothed in mourning and cut off from sympathy. So had he increased his safety by increasing his solitude. The presiding genius in his home was now that domestic fury, Salome, his sister, whose blood was all Herodian and whom God providentially left there to avenge Herodian crimes.

The excesses in banqueting and wantonness into which he plunged to drown sorrow, were of no avail. In his flight for similar purpose to the wilderness of Samaria his burning memories followed him. A fugitive from his crown, or in his palace, he could not flee from himself. And, as is natural and necessary, there being no repentance or reformation, he became hardened, and sunk into deeper crimes of despotism. He grew so cruel, that upon the least occasion he was ready to put any one to death. While lying dangerously ill at Samaria, his mother-in-law, Alexandra, was plotting at Jerusalem to take possession of the kingdom. Being informed of this, he ordered her death at once. And so another member of the rival house of the Maccabees was cut off. In the second year following, Salome raised his suspicions of several leading persons who had favored the Asmonæan interest when Herod captured Jerusalem. These, with many others, accused as accomplices in some recent plot, or being remote branches of the ancient Asmonæan family, he at once put to death. So he removed all those who excelled in dignity, that he might do whatsoever he pleased, and have none to resist him.

By this extravagant tyranny and sacrifice of human life he alienated the most of the Jewish people from him. He was of the stock of Edom and Arabia, and so from the first they regarded his right as remote and doubtful, to call himself a Jew, or fill an office over them that only a Jew could properly fill.

Yet was he Jewish, though a descendant of Esau. But in heart and policy he was wholly gentile. Religion was nothing to him except as an instrument of state. He had all the ambition and royal feelings of the kings about him, and sought to be like them. So he sought to make the Jewish nation in its policy and usages like the heathen nations. After his dangerous sickness, therefore, at Samaria, he threw off all disguise, and showed his utter dislike of Judaism as a religious system, and at once began to introduce foreign rites and customs.

He first instituted heathen games, consisting of wrestling and the like, after the manner of the Romans, to be observed every fifth year; and by music, sumptuous entertainments, and the offer of costly prizes, he endeavored to gather on these occasions a vast concourse at Jerusalem from the surrounding nations. He next built a theatre in Jerusalem, a thing most incongruous in the holy city. But it marked a moral stage in the man. It suited his morality and piety. It was congenial to the depraved character of the man. And he showed great tact in introducing it as a means to accomplish his object. He wished to overthrow the Jewish religion and temple service and turn the Jews to the idolatry, heathenism and corruption of the gentile nations. The theatre was an instrument admirably adapted and wisely chosen for this end. Of a heathen origin, inherently vicious in its tendencies, and the foe of morality and religion wherever patronized, its influence has always been demoralizing. Nor was Herod the only or the last man who has established a theatre to change the rites and customs of religion and the doctrine and life of a consistent piety. He was as wise as he was wicked in bringing into the holy city the theatre to become the rival and ultimately supplanter of the temple. With like feeling and purpose he built a splendid amphitheatre on the plain near the city, in which were contests for prizes by personal combat, music, chariot racing and the like. Here he also gathered a great variety of ferocious wild beasts, that were to fight among themselves for the gratification of the audience, or with criminals condemned to death, who were first armed and then exposed to these savage animals.

All this stirred the Jews to a deep indignation. It put their whole religious system in danger. Ten of them, therefore, con-

spired to assassinate Herod. But the plot was discovered by one of the many spies whom he always employed, and so the conspirators boldly confessed their intention and died with great manliness, as dying to save their holy city and religion from pollution and destruction. When afterward certain infuriated ones had tortured this spy to a miserable death, Herod brought a terrible judgment on them, peculiar to himself; for he not only destroyed them but all their families.

But this severity of the tyrant did not check the ardent hostility of the people toward him. He was not slow to see this and so prepared for his personal defence. Already he had Antonia as a palace castle in Jerusalem. This fortress was immense and almost impregnable. It was built by one of the Maccabees, and Herod rebuilt, enlarged and beautified it. It joined on the north the area on which the temple was built. The enclosure was nearly equal to the entire enclosure of the temple, and was surrounded by a wall sixty feet high.

"Within it had all the extent and appearance of a palace, being divided into apartments of every kind, with galleries and baths, and also broad halls or barracks for soldiers. So that, as having everything necessary within itself, it seemed a city, while in its magnificence it was a palace. At each of the four corners was a tower. Three of these were seventy-five feet high, while the fourth, at the south east corner, was over a hundred feet high, and overlooked the whole temple and its courts. The fortress communicated with the northern and western porticos of the temple area, and had flights of stairs descending into both, by which the garrison could at any time enter the court of the temple and prevent tumults." Rob. Pal., I: 292.

The entire area of this fortress of Antonia was probably from north to south some five hundred or six hundred feet, and from west to east about nine hundred and twenty-five feet, that is, an area as wide and about two-thirds as deep as the area of the temple. Rob. Pales., I: 291—3, III: 233, 4.

In such a stronghold Herod would feel safe within the city of Jerusalem. But the evident bitterness of the people against him, as well as the recent conspiracy, suggested to him fortresses in other parts of the Holy Land both as places of safe refuge for himself in emergencies, and to overawe the country in any tendencies to rebellion. One of these fortresses he built

in the city of Samaria. This city, about a day's journey from Jerusalem, wasted by wars and much neglected, Herod rebuilt on an enlarged and very splendid scale. He inclosed it with a high and strong wall, two and one-half miles in circuit. On the heights within the walls he erected a formidable fortress, and the whole place he garrisoned with six thousand soldiers. The extent and splendor of this work may be inferred from the appearance of the immense ruins still visible.

Dr. Robinson found there a colonnade nearly three thousand feet long. About eighty columns of it were still standing, and very many lying on the ground. They were of limestone, sixteen feet long, two feet in diameter at the base, and one foot eight inches at the top. This work he says, "is probably to be referred to the time of Herod the Great." Rob. Pales., II: 388.

And for both his own glory, and for his defence in his kingdom, he built Caesarea. This was a seaport of the Mediterranean, and noted in New Testament history. Here in the amphitheatre built by his father, Herod the Great, Herod Agrippa was smitten of God for not praising the Most High, when the people flattered him. Here Cornelius, the centurion, and Philip, the deacon, with his four daughters were baptized. And here Agabus prophesied to Paul that he would be bound at Jerusalem. Here, too, the great apostle pleaded before Felix, was imprisoned two years, and then made his final defence before Festus and king Agrippa.

The whole coast of Palestine is much exposed to westerly storms from the Mediterranean, and furnishes no good harbors. Herod observed this, and so to remedy the evil, he undertook at Caesarea one of those vast labors of olden time that only a king can assume to do. He turned his attention to build a large and safe harbor, and a city adjoining. He constructed a semi-circular breakwater within which a large fleet could ride safely. We have some idea of the vastness of this work when we remember that the water was one hundred and twenty feet deep where he constructed it. "This he effected," says Josephus, "by letting down vast stones of above fifty feet in length, not less than eighteen in breadth, and nine in depth." Ants. XV. 9. And his work in the city was worthy such a harbor. For

he built many splendid palaces and houses, as also a theatre and amphitheatre and temple. These were built of white stone faced, and presented a very imposing appearance.

This vast work engaged the attention and labor of Herod for ten or twelve years. When it was completed he made a great display at its dedication. He provided games for contests in music, wrestling, boxing, horse-racing and fighting with wild beasts. For these plays he furnished the most costly and beautiful ornaments and furniture. And as the place, formerly called Straton's Tower, was now to be called Cæsarea in honor of Cæsar Augustus, Julia the empress sent, for the occasion, a large part of her wardrobe and theatrical apparatus for such displays, to the value it is said of five hundred talents. All the vast concourse of spectators who came to witness this celebration Herod maintained at his own expense and in a most sumptuous manner. So in this part of his kingdom, at a point fifty-five miles north of Jerusalem, Herod built a harbor and seaport of great public utility, but mainly for the display of his own greatness and glory, and as a military stronghold to keep his subjects in awe.

Herod had a peculiar passion for building cities and castles, palaces and theatres. The number of these that he built wholly new, or renewed from their decay was very great. But in all this public work the motives were one and the same, the display of his own glory, and the better protection of himself in his kingdom against the rebellion of the people whom he most cruelly oppressed. As to the expenses of these vast and varied works, it was nothing to him. He forced taxes on his subjects to any amount needed; and when he wanted laborers for any enterprise, he ordered whom he chose to the work, and they received little in payment but their living from day to day. So in this way he often had hundreds and even thousands of men employed on these great public works.

It will serve to give a better view of this wonderful man if we mention some of the stupendous labors that he performed in building towns and fortresses and royal abodes. We can take space, however, only to name them, and that, too, without regard to the order of time in which he executed them. A city in ruins on the coast south of Gaza, called Anthedon, he re-

built, and named Agrippias, in honor of his friend Agrippa. This city was afterwards called Darum or Daron, and became celebrated as a fortress in the time of the Crusades. Rob. Pal. II: 38. We also mention, among his works, Antipatris, Cypros, the tower of Phaselus in Jerusalem, and a city by the same name north of Jericho, the fortress Herodium and a royal villa around it, theatres at Tripoli, Damascus, Sidon and Ptolemai, the walls of Biblus, temples and market-places at Beirut and Tyre, vast aqueducts at Laodicea, and fountains and baths at Ascalon. The temple of Apollo he rebuilt in a very splendid manner, after it had been destroyed by fire, and a public square in Antioch of Syria, offensive and shunned for its uncleanness, he paved with polished marble, though it was two and a half miles long.

But it is time to hasten through some of the more conspicuous to the concluding events in the life of this eminently wicked man. From what has been said of him it will be seen that he was a man of uncommon powers of mind and therefore had great ability to be wicked. Some are as wicked as Herod, so far as they are able. But he had great capacity for being eminent and enormous in a life of crime, and he used his powers almost to their full extent in the way of crime and blood.

Two of his sons by his beloved wife, Mariamne, viz., Alexander and Aristobulus, he sent to Rome to be educated, under the patronage of Augustus the Emperor. In the twenty-second year of his reign, B. C. 16, he went to Rome to see them. Finding them well instructed according to the notions of a royal education at that time he took them home to Judæa, and they were soon married as became their rank. But Salome, that fury in the house of Herod, his sister, whose veins were filled with unqualified and unmixed Herodian blood, and who with her accomplices had procured the death of Mariamne their mother, now feared vengeance at the hands of these sons. She therefore conspired for their death. For three years they lived in the palace with their father, and were neither slow nor prudent in expressing their resentment of the death of their mother. These expressions Salome and those confederate with her, carefully treasured and turned artfully into reproaches and even threats against Herod their father. With such coloring and

distortion as they knew so well how to give, they misrepresented the young men to their father. He had looked to them as his successors in the kingdom, and gave them preëminence in the palace over his other sons.

But this manœuvre excited his jealousy, and rather to restrain and reform than disinherit his favorite sons, Herod brought to the palace and placed above them in honor, for the time being, Antipater, his eldest son by his first wife. This wife, Doris, had been divorced to make way for Mariamme, and so this son had been brought up in private. Stung by this ill treatment of his mother and himself, and always coveting and plotting for the crown, he gladly received and used his accidental position at the palace to secure his end. And so well did he and the other conspirators succeed, that four years after Herod had taken Alexander and Aristobulus from Rome, as heirs apparent to the throne he introduced this Antipater there to the patronage of Augustus as the real heir, and placed the two sons of Mariamme as secondary.

So adroitly did Antipater and the confederates manage the suspicions and jealousies of Herod that the next year, B.C. 11, he took the two sons of Mariamme before Augustus in Italy and accused them of seeking his life by poison. Augustus, however, saw through the intrigues of Salome, Antipater and the rest, and so reconciled Herod to the young men. On return Herod stated the reconciliation to the Jews in the temple, but still he kept Antipater as the first heir of the throne.

The plotting however continued, and Herod was so tormented by false reports of treason by his sons that he could not be easy nor feel safe, day or night. To gain evidence against the young men he put their servants to the torture. So tormented, and to escape such terrible agonies they falsely accused Alexander. He was at once thrown into prison and loaded with chains. Thus unjustly treated by his father he devised a plan to vex and torment him to the greatest possible extent. He therefore confessed plots and conspiracies against his father, that never existed, and involved in them two of Herod's prime ministers, his brother Pheroras, and that fiend of the household, Salome, his sister, and many other of Herod's chief friends. So this unnatural son of an unnatural father gained his wicked purpose. For

he was naturally a very jealous and suspicious man. And the consciousness of his awful tyranny and cruelty and bloody stratagems to carry his own ends, led him to look for like things in others toward himself. Therefore he believed all the false stories of Alexander, and so was tormented by his anger and fears beyond measure. Some of the accused he put to death at once, and some he put to death on the rack because they would not confess to what was totally untrue of them. So he executed friends and foes indiscriminately, as one who strikes in the dark. As he had no certain knowledge his fears were his counsellors. And he filled his palace with horror and torture and cries and blood.

This Alexander had married the daughter of Archelaus, king of Cappadocia. In this terrible domestic and royal feud he interposed for his daughter's sake; and effected another reconciliation. It however continued but a year or two, Salome and Pheroras, his sister and brother, and Antipater his son, still seeking the death of the young princes. Then Herod obtained permission from Augustus to try his sons, and if he saw fit to put them to death. He called a council of his friends. The death of his sons was a foregone conclusion. The trial was a mockery. They were condemned, and having been imprisoned in the fortress he built in Samaria, were there strangled by order of their inhuman father.

Thus perished two more of those who were nearest to Herod by the ties of blood and should have been dearest by the ties of affection. At this time of the troubles concerning the young princes, and their trial and death, all Judea was in anxiety and fear. The great theme of thought was Herod and his sons. It was the theme of thought. For all men were afraid to speak their mind. While they had pity for the young men, and indignation against the conspirators and a deep hatred of Herod and his policy, they dared not speak their own thoughts, or even hear another express his. The people were shut up, through fear, to an oppressive silence.

But a blunt and bold old soldier, who had served under Herod, openly expressed his views to the king himself. He assured him of the general dissatisfaction with his treatment of his sons. In his statements to the king he implicated about

three hundred persons, all of whom, with the old soldier and his son, Herod moved the multitude to stone to death. About the same time he had his sons strangled in Sebaste, the fortress in Samaria.

Near to this time it was that the angel of the Lord announced the birth of John the Baptist to his father Zacharias, while he ministered in the temple. So it will be seen with comfort that we are drawing nigh to the end of life for this monster of iniquity and cruelty.

It is painfully interesting to notice now how his own iniquities seized upon him, and how his crimes involved and burdened and tormented him. He shows at this point in his awful career how a life of sin is a life of terrible servitude, and how the wages of sin are torment.

Alexander and Aristobulus being dead, Antipater stands alone as the acknowledged heir of the throne. Schooled to intrigue, corruption and blood by the practice and in the very palace of his father, will it be strange if he begin to practise as he has been taught? Nothing now stands between him and the crown but the life of his father. He enters at once into a conspiracy to dispatch the old man by poison.

Among the conspirators for this Antipater engaged Pheroras, brother of Herod. Between these brothers there had long been ill feeling. For at two several times Herod had offered to his brother one of his daughters by Mariamne in marriage. Pheroras declined each, and instead took one of his maid servants. And also when Herod had fined seven thousand Pharisees for refusing to take the oath of allegiance to Augustus, the wife of Pheroras, who sympathized with this sect, paid for them the entire fine. From these and other causes of dislike, Herod was very severe toward Pheroras.

He therefore readily joined with Antipater his nephew to remove his brother by poison. Though the plot failed, it gave Herod immense trouble and anxiety. When it was discovered it was also found that Antipater had previously poisoned two of his brothers that they might not be in the way of his succession to the crown. Such a household of intrigue and murder was that whole Herodian family. Antipater himself, being con-

victed of his plot to put his own father off the throne, was executed in regular course of justice.

Between the discovery of his plot and his execution there were seven months. In this interval it was that our Lord Christ was born.

And now there was entered on the page of history by the hand of Herod, one of those hideous crimes, one of those enormities in wickedness, that signalize the actor and the age, and make the ear of the world tingle at the recital.

For many years before the advent of Christ the Eastern world was filled with predictions and expectation of the coming of some wonderful personage. He was to come as a universal sovereign, and his kingdom was to be in bliss and righteousness. These predictions had many of them received a definite form and statement, and he who was to reign was constantly expected. The place of his birth was designated in some of these predictions as Judaea. So Tacitus records the feeling thus: "Many fully believed that there was a prediction in the ancient books of the priests, to be fulfilled about this time, that a people from Judaea should obtain the empire of the world." v. 13. And Suetonius has a similar remark. "An old and fixed notion prevailed in the East, that near this time men should spring up in Judaea and obtain universal empire." In Vesp. 4. Simon, Anna the prophetess, and the Jews generally, expected in this wonderful personage, the Messiah. And in their idea of his reign they gave undue prominence to temporal redemption and supremacy. The Romans, and other gentile nations, who had the expectations just quoted from their historians, were looking only for a new and strange worldly king.

In the midst of these predictions, impressions and general expectations, Christ our Lord is born at Bethlehem. The great fact is somewhat known, yet feebly apprehended and understood even by the most godly and believing of the Jews, and by those immediately connected with the families of Elizabeth and of Mary. Still the vague yet exciting thought that Shiloh had indeed come, goes abroad. It is at first as a pale light enveloped by mist and shut up by clouds in some deep valley. Slowly the rays go out, climbing the hillsides, and lighting up obscurely here and there a mountain height. Then eyes from afar that

had long been watching catch the bright vision. They hasten with offerings for him who is born King of the Jews. They make inquiries for him—a strange company of travellers from afar. They pass over hills in the very sight of Jerusalem and Herod's palace and ask for another heir to the throne of Judaea. "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" How swiftly some spy whispers those words in the ear of Herod.

He is troubled, and all Jerusalem with him. He runs over the bloody list of Maccabean and Herodian relatives whom he had ordered to be put to death, to protect his crown. And now there is another born, King of the Jews. He learns the locality where the predicted and expected king is to be born. He calls the wise men, and with satanic hypocrisy speeds them in their search for the young child. "And when ye have found him bring me word again, that I may come and worship him also." How cool and deep and awful the purpose of this monster!

But God interposed. The wise men worshipped and departed under the guidance of the Almighty. The holy family, warned of God, fled into Egypt. Then the anger, and madness, and fears of Herod were stirred. His throne was in danger. The wise men had mocked him. The reputed infant king was not to be found. Couriers run to and fro, but in vain. The infant Jesus could not be discovered. Many families in Bethlehem rejoiced over an infant, that was more to them than all Herod's gifts, and all Judaea's honors. Ignorant of the flight of Joseph and Mary, Herod thought that this prophetic heir to a throne must still be one of those little ones that made the hills and valleys of Bethlehem so joyous. Had human life ever baffled him in a project? Had the shedding of blood ever kept him from executing a wish? Was not his throne already surrounded by the graves of his kindred? Why then should the blood of infants make him waver in his purpose? Doubtless no whisper of conscience troubled him. The word went to make sure work. The sword followed, "and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in the coasts thereof, from two years old and under." Then "was there a voice heard, lamentation and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted because they were not."

We see the bloody men, as they hurry from house to house. We see the terror stricken mothers as they try to flee or to hide away their children. We hear the unconscious cry of the concealed little one, and the shriek of the mother that follows the discovery, and mingles with the dying moans of her babe. We see stout men who have fathers' hearts stand nobly by their children, and make their spears red with the blood of the hireling murderers. Yet all in vain. The eagle swoops upon the nestling brood and is away, and they are gone. Another day, and what sorrow among those hills of Bethlehem, what burial services, what lonely cottages, and what burning, bitter thoughts of Herod.

What a fact this awful tragedy to stand connected with the holy child Jesus, and with the man Christ Jesus. Very like in later days his remembrance of this gave a peculiar tenderness and earnestness to his manner and words with the little children.

But we change the place and the scene. We leave Bethlehem for Jericho. An old man of seventy years lies there in a palace hall. Terrible diseases are on him. He has been to the hot baths beyond Jordan, but without benefit. Strength fails him and he pauses short of Jerusalem in the return. His indomitable courage still abides, and his iron will is unbroken. He knows that he must die, and he knows too that all Judæa and Idumæa and Samaria will break forth into singing when it is proclaimed, Herod is dead. Swept on by a passion for iniquity on a scale beyond all former enormities in crime, he summons to him all the chief men of his kingdom, as if for counsel and state purposes, and then shuts them up under guard in the amphitheatre. Then he calls Salome his sister, that goddess of discord, and says: 'I will have mourning when I die. So soon as the breath leaves my body, turn loose the soldiery upon these my chief men, and put them all to death. Then shall there be weeping in all my realm, when it is said, Herod is dead.' But a little latent remnant of humanity kept her from executing this atrocious command.

Now God's hand pressed more and more heavily on the giant sinner, crowding him into eternity. A slow fever burned within him. Ulcers ate his bowels and filled him with agonies. His limbs swelled and burst in dropsy. Sores that bred worms

wasted him. A foulness of breath kept attendants at a distance. Paroxysms and convulsions worried and tortured him. "Thus," says Josephus, "he died, in horrible pain and torment, smitten of God in this signal and grievous manner, for his many enormous iniquities."

ARTICLE III.

FAITH A SOURCE OF KNOWLEDGE.

HAVE we no medium of vision save these material organs of sight? Can we perceive nothing but that which comes to us through the discernment of the understanding alone? We look around on the outlying world: we send our investigating powers on excursions to distant ages and climes for knowledge. Is this all our resource? Are we shut up within these limits of instruction inexorably? May we learn nothing which cannot be mastered by the senses, the bare and naked intellect? It would pitifully narrow in our horizon to affirm this. There is a higher avenue of truth, there are loftier objects of knowledge to the spiritual man, than these. That avenue is Faith; those objects are the revelations of God which transcend, in parts of their projection and elevation, the entire comprehension of the finite.

But what is faith; what is it not? It is not superstition. It is not credulity. It is neither the weakness of first nor second childishness. Its absence is not the ascendancy of reason, the proof of manly thought. Just the reverse is often the fact. Extreme scepticism and credulousness are quite natural associates. The freest-thinking is frequently the most puerile. Prof. Trench has an excellent remark concerning Dives in the parable:

"His unbelief shows itself again in supposing that his brethren would give heed to a ghost, while they refused to give heed to the sure word of God—to Moses and the prophets. For it is of the

very essence of unbelief, that it gives that credence to portents and prodigies which it refuses to the truth of God. Caligula, who mocked at the existence of the gods, would hide himself under a bed when it thundered; and superstition and incredulity are evermore twin brothers"!*

So men now will run after half-crazed "spirit-rappers," who laugh to scorn the idea that holy men of old "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," and that these Scriptures are those divine words. Let us at the outset get rid of the notion that faith is mental imbecility, and its absence mental strength.

Christian belief does not require our assent to any palpable absurdity. It does not, for example, lay it upon our conscience to hold that, by a few spoken words, a man can turn a little cake of flour and water into the body, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ. When, at the sacramental feast, our Lord took the bread and said, "This is my body," it is not true that he meant to affirm an exact identity of substance between that bread and the hand which held it; or that he designed his church to believe that the holy eucharist is a literal consumption of his flesh and blood. By a constant miracle of power, even this might be possible. But all of God's miracles are those of wisdom as well as of omnipotence. This could not be the former. It could subserve no morally valuable end. It would simply be stupendous folly, a monstrous absurdity. To attempt to accredit its reality would be an effort of superstition, not of faith.

Nor does this challenge our assent to impossibilities. It makes no part of its creed that the Divine nature is a trinity with respect to the same facts and relations which constitute it a unity. It tells us not that God is able to be or to do what, in the nature of things, can neither be nor be done. He cannot be true and false, honest and dishonest; cannot govern a moral being by merely physical laws; cannot make wrong right, or the reverse. To strive to give him such ability is to confer on him no honor. He asks no such faith, as he claims no such sovereignty. God respects the limitations of the possible. Whatever can be accomplished he can effect. To believe more than this is not Christian belief.

Nor is this to concede what flatly contradicts reason. Within

* *Trench on the Parables*, pp. 368—369.

certain boundaries, its decisions are reliable. If we are told that the saving grace of the Gospel is lodged in a class of men, the virtue of whose ministration depends upon an unbroken chain of succession connecting their ordination with the twelve apostles, we reject it as unreasonable that this should be the condition of salvation to our race. It neither does credit to God's wisdom nor to ours, in a matter plainly within the range of our comprehension; nor does it meet the demands of historical research. We clearly conclude that, amid the disruptions of so many ages, this chain would certainly lose here and there a link, as authentic records show it has; and that the whole theory is an irrational assumption. So does a calm judgment reject as fiction the modern revelations of pretended prophets of God; the foolish trumpery of "latter-day" miracles, inspirations; the religious powers of dead men's bones, and live men's penances. Reason, sitting on her rightful throne, and not usurping a higher than she is competent to fill, pronounces all this inanity to be undeserving her regard, because in positive conflict with her sound dictates.

The ground which Chillingworth defends against the Romanists, that Scripture must be used, in a reasonable way, as the true and only arbiter of religious controversies, we see no cause to abandon, lest the concession be turned against ourselves by those who call themselves rationalists *par excellence*. With proper explanations and limitations, as that strong writer lays them down, we too say:

"For my part, I am certain, that God hath given us our reason, to discern between truth and falsehood; and he that makes not this use of it, but believes things he knows not why; I say, it is by chance that he believes the truth, and not by choice; and that I cannot but fear, that God will not accept this sacrifice of fools."*

But now we have reached the point of a careful discrimination. Now, it is most easy, and to some, most tempting, to throw off all the requirements of faith, to assert that our powers of judging must be deferred to as supreme, through the entire circuit of spiritual facts. Avoiding the shallows of superstition, they drift upon the rocks of scepticism. Fearful of believing

* "The Religion of Protestants, a Safe way to Salvation." Philadelphia: 1 vol. octavo 1844. p. 150. § 113.

too much, they refuse to believe anything beyond their reach. But, as we have seen, to abandon the grounds of a legitimate faith in the invisible world is to run very naturally into the weakest speculations concerning it. For among our constitutional capacities and necessities is this leaning over of the soul upon unseen and as yet uncomprehended realities. As it knows there is a God and an immortality, so does it know that there is another sphere than this, full of wonders which it now discerns, if at all, only as through a glass obscurely. Men do not, therefore, become thorough rationalists by renouncing the spirit of a religious trust. Probably there is no such thing as an at all enlightened mind which is convinced of that only which it can completely understand. Our souls are companions of a great brotherhood of spirits, countless multitudes of whom will have no incarnation like ours; but they exist in a universe of moral relations with us; and often we are conscious of feeling in our blindness after what we are persuaded must be, and we seek some one who shall lead us by the hand amidst these but partially opened apartments of our being and destiny. We do not live in a narrow cell, every inch of whose configuration we can touch, and measure, and analyze. There are windows in our prison walls through which we catch glorious glimpses of mountain, ocean, and the bright or clouded altitudes of heaven. But what of this is shadow and what is substance, faith taught by its divine instructors must tell us.

Pretended religious doctrine has, in different periods, demanded the acceptance of various absurd, impossible, unreasonable ideas, assumptions. And we have affirmed that Christian belief repudiates justly all such claims upon its respect. But two things do not follow: first, that all the demands which may be made upon this principle are also absurd, impossible, irrational; nor, secondly, that everything is thus which may seem to be so, to the cursory view. Very many facts in natural science have been stoutly denied on just these grounds, which are now among the unchallenged maxims of the schools. Hardly a department of physics but has been compelled to fight its way to belief through most determined and formidable reiterations, aye, demonstrations, of its extravagances, falsehoods, ridiculous or wicked senselessness. Such histories are sug-

gestive of caution, humility, self-distrust, particularly in fields of spiritual investigation. Reason, upon its own proper level, is a very trustworthy guide. No one has any wish to disgrace, to dethrone it, in order to decorate with its despoiled honors an encroaching rival. You might as well say that the eye is insulted, wronged, because you sometimes place a telescope to it, to help it take in an object too remote for its unassisted angle of vision. Faith is reason's telescope, sweeping the outlying spaces of the moral universe. Its necessity is, that there is much to be known which transcends our natural grasp of thought. It presupposes as it proves, that there are firmaments above us, gemmed with constellations of spiritual truths which, without its use, must remain veiled forever to our perception; which it does not indeed altogether discover to our comprehension, but whose existence it plainly reveals. Some of these far-off bodies it shows us as central suns; and some, as secondary orbs; and some as unresolved nebulae; but all composing a grand system, worthy of God's authorship, deserving of our confidence, where we cannot no less than where we can explain its ongoings; and opening to the trustful heart a delightful anticipation of studies to be pursued indefinitely into the nature of God and his government, with ample success, when faith shall be merged into sight.

It should suffice to satisfy us of the justness of these positions, to remember the circumstances in which Christ uttered these among other memorable words—"Said I not unto thee that if thou wouldst believe, thou shouldst see the glory of God?" It was at the tomb of Lazarus. It referred directly to the resurrection of that dead brother of Martha to life. Christ had promised this to those sisters, "Thy brother shall rise again"; and he had explicitly narrowed down his intention to the then present time. But Martha could not accredit that pledge. The dead man was sleeping beyond her gaze; and how much further away was his winged spirit than his corrupting flesh? "Rise again? Rise now?" And if she had spoken what doubtless she felt—"this is too absurd, impossible, unreasonable, for a moment's belief"—who, of all that throng would not have responded—"even so"! But was it either of these? No. Lazarus lived at Christ's reviving call, and Mar-

tha's scepticism was the only irrational thing on this occasion. It was so, not because the promise did not seem to be most strange, unnatural, impracticable; but because reason should have persuaded her that whatever Christ might offer to do, he could and ought to do. Faith assumes that every word of God is true; that there is a reliable basis, a worthy cause of all his revelations respecting himself and us. If he tells us that which is as foreign to our ordinary experience and observation as was the assurance to the sisters of Bethany of their brother's restoration from the embrace of death, we are to believe it. It is more rational to put confidence in God than not to, against all appearances; for be these what they may, they will never involve him in folly nor unreason. That he may demand our credence to disclosures totally unexpected, and which we never should have dreamed to be actual otherwise, the incident before us demonstrates. Christ required Martha to believe in her brother's immediate resurrection. There is nothing seemingly more absurd, impossible, unreasonable, in an orthodox interpretation of Christian doctrine than that demand of Jesus upon human faith. Therefore, this may be as deserving our belief as was that. The difficulties of the subject will not determine the question, but the evidence fairly weighed that the Bible is God's communication of religious truth; and the application to its contents of the strict laws of verbal criticism and exegesis, with no forced disruptions nor contortions of the text towards this or another theory.

Here our doctrine finds an important practical bearing. One of the most constant and unyielding requisitions of Christian faith respects the inspired authority of these Scriptures, and the acceptance of their guidance beyond the line, in some places, of our full understanding. This topic of a written book from God to us takes immeasurable precedence of all others in vital interest. It is of supreme moment that, with reference to its claims, the mind and the heart, knowledge and belief, should occupy their proper positions. Neither alone can settle the question aright. It lays a weighty tax on reason and faith conjointly, while it has no use for presumption or superstition whatever. We avail ourselves with pleasure of a sentence or two, by one who will not be charged with bigotry on the subject of inspira-

tion—Neander; in which the true path along this most debatable ground seems to be very happily indicated.

"We need no further revelations. On the contrary, it must be to us as if the Lord had himself, at this moment, spoken to us, inasmuch as he has given us the instruction required for all the highest necessities of the present; as if he had himself said to us all which it concerns us to know, in order to find consolation under present sufferings, the means of certain victory in all our conflicts, the clue to guide us out of all the perplexities of a distracted age safely to our goal. Divine truth has been revealed to us—in this historical embodiment, in this application to individual cases, to specific historical circumstances and social relations, imparted through the instrumentality of individual men, who lived as depositaries of divine truth among their fellow-men; who, in the common intercourse of human life, testified of and revealed the divine, speaking and acting as men, each in his own peculiar human manner, though hallowed indeed by the Spirit of God. Thus was divine truth to be brought humanly near to us. Thus to our own special activity, under the guiding and quickening influence of the Spirit of God, without whom nothing divine can be received or understood, was to be left the work of investigating the divine in its connection with the human."*

This covers the case. These are God's words. They are to be studied as an actual revelation, in their adaptation to our wants, social, spiritual, temporal, eternal; with reference to our earthly and heavenly salvation; with all the faculties of an aroused and patient intellect; but where this fails us, with that heartfelt trust in God's superior knowledge which comes through a "humble dependence on that Divine Spirit, who alone leads into all truth and unlocks the depths of his word."* God has treasured up his "glory" in these disclosures of his sovereignty and grace, his power and love. But the believing soul alone can see that glory in its fulness.

Sceptical casuists are not so sure that a miraculously attested revelation from God is impossible, as when Baden Powell planted himself there in the "Essays and Reviews." M. Renan does not venture that stretch of bare negation, and the later deliverances of the *Westminster Review* avoid so exposed and indefensible a position. It now distinctly admits "that law and miracle may coexist." There is too much of the old faith in an

* "Neander on Philippians." pp. 19—21. Octavo edition.

Almighty God, at least among the common folk, to tolerate what can never be other than an arrogant and ignorant assumption, whencesoever this statement may come, that a miracle cannot take place in any circumstances. How do you know it is not possible? is answer enough to such an impertinence. The writer of the article on "Miracles" in the October reprint of the *Westminster* puts the case thus :

"As there is a limit to our knowledge of the Divine Being and no limit to divine power, there is no warrant for the assertion that miracles are impossible; but our readiness to accept them will depend on their conformity or non-conformity to the conception we have formed of His character. If we regard him as an arbitrary Being, we shall expect incoherence in nature, and the incompatibility of miracle and law will not be felt by us. If on the contrary we believe him to be unchangeable, we shall be disposed to look for the expression of his will not in temporary expedients to meet passing emergencies, but in laws which are as permanent as his being. The more we know of nature, the more deeply are we impressed with the uniformity which pervades it, and the higher our conception of mind, the more orderly and calculable do we find its operations; so that increase of knowledge tends to correct our first impressions of arbitrariness in God and a corresponding discontinuity in nature. Science thus modifies our conception of God, and this reacts upon our views of nature, till miracles are felt to be inconsistent with both."—p. 170.

This is respectful in comparison with much which has been written on that side. Yet we do not concede the inconsistency here alleged: nor do we feel much force in this reasoning:

"Any attempt to recommend the miraculous by assimilating it to the natural must necessarily end in failure. If miracles are brought within the compass of law, the aversion entertained toward them by scientific minds may be overcome; but their essential distinction is lost, and they differ in no respect from other natural phenomena. The supposition that they are brought about by higher laws, does not at all affect the question. Higher laws, we are told, counteract lower, and miracles may be in accordance with laws which lie beyond human knowledge: but higher laws make no approach to the supernatural. We can never transcend the region of the relative by climbing to more extended generalizations."—p. 169.

The question is not of terms but of facts. It is not essential

to the defence of Christianity that the term "supernatural" be retained. The point at issue is — has God employed the powers of the physical world to attest the divine commission of men, in an extraordinary manner to such an extent, that the whole effect of the interposition upon the human mind carries the conviction of his presence and agency for this express end. If it should be found eventually that the raising of the dead, for instance, as in the Gospels, was in harmony with natural law in its more occult relations and workings, this would not prejudice the event so recorded, nor weaken its influence as a seal set by Heaven upon the words of prophets and apostles and Christ. Was the dead man actually restored to life by Divine power, to authenticate the mission of Jesus as the Christian prophet, priest, and king? Is the record that of a fact or fable? If the former, then how the Almighty did it through the intervention of the laws of matter or spirit — whether supernaturally, or preternaturally, or naturally — does not change the result. To God everything is natural. But to man much is not, which nevertheless is so to man's and nature's Author. The power of the miraculous upon the human mind is in its apparent (not necessarily real) discontinuity of cause and effect. We make this concession, by way of argument as against the lame logic of the reviewer; but not as thereby holding ourselves to the positive defence of any theory of the miraculous which, by the conditions of the problem, is beyond our mental reach.

Our inquiry has virtually answered a question which naturally suggests itself in this connection, as to the value of an educational or hereditary faith. It is more easy to talk fluently on this subject than soundly. It is a flattering thought to put every topic of knowledge to an independent and original investigation, and thus to settle our opinions respecting its merits. But we are able to do this on comparatively few tracks of research. Time is too short and art is too long. Science is too multifarious, even within its more familiar and everyday applications. Civilization could not go forward upon an advancing path, but would merely run around a small circle, if every generation began at the same initial point to educate itself. It does not deem this to be needful nor reasonable in any department of secular wisdom. Successive ages enter upon the heritage of the fathers, as their

rightful and real patrimony; nor imagine it at all incumbent upon their mental manliness to pry up and re-demonstrate these well-done labors of by-gone times. Many conclusions are fixed in law, physics, government, art, so that their principles are considered worthy of acceptance by the people as matters of credence. And this, too, be it understood, on faith in others. For what do the masses know of the analysis of a thousand experiments in mechanics, chemistry, and the like, the results of which they nevertheless receive undoubtingly. How many, also, comprehend our Newtonian theory of the heavens, who are quite persuaded, however, that it is the earth and not the sun which rises and sets. Men show their discretion in not being ashamed to believe the testimony of competent persons concerning facts of the material world; facts which they never have and never will see; which they could not explain nor comprehend by any effort of their minds. And our children are learning to believe many such things; it is a part of their training, of necessity. By and bye, they will discover the reasons of more or less of this instruction; but the whole of them, probably never. Secular education goes along very largely and properly on the basis of hereditary faith.

Is there nothing, then, fixed in religion? Essentially and fundamentally there is much, there is enough for human salvation, firmly settled. To deny this is to asperse most dishonorably both God and man. It charges each with mental imbecility and moral obliquity to affirm that theological science is all adrift on uncertain currents, tossing like a loosened raft in ruinous confusion. What discord there is springs far more from wrong spiritual tendencies and affinities than from an ingenuous intellectual divergence. What though infidelity denies, and latitudinarianism stumbles at, the requisitions of a true Christianity! It is not, therefore, the less true, as expounded by the countless accordant voices of the regenerate from the beginning. For there is a concord in this testimony, as to essentials of doctrine and life, vastly beyond that to which the interpreters of not a little currently accepted secular philosophy have yet attained. Men would see this, if a perverse bias did not obscure their vision.

We therefore contend, that to require an independent investi-

gation of religious science, in order to a fixed belief thereof, is irrational; that it is just as proper to inculcate the principles of Christian doctrine, as a part of education, as it is to teach the axioms and maxims of any earthly branch of knowledge; that it is more incumbent, as divine transcends human wisdom; that parents should transmit, as a most precious legacy, a sound, theoretic religious faith to their offspring; that no one should be ashamed to believe more than he has thoroughly studied here, on the trust which he reposes in those who have gone down into the depths of these researches both theoretically and experimentally. To say that we cannot thus believe is to contradict what we know that we are continually doing. A sad concession has been made at this point, by the church, to the mis-called rationality of the age. It is time to take it back, with no apologies or reservations; and for every believer in Christ and the Bible to feel that it is his highest duty to make his Christian life a part of the life of all for whose souls God will, in any measure, hold him responsible. If this shall afterwards influence in that direction individual studies upon this subject, it will not be likely very much more to do this, than fairly to counterbalance the natural propensity of fallen man to ruinous delusion, to sin-indulging, pride-inflating error.

But faith has its true existence not in the mere assent of the will to the revelations of God, but in the love of the regenerated heart. It is not simply that we dispute not the mysteries or the severities of God's government of law and redemption. It is that we embrace them with a fervent affection, because they are the ordination of God our Father. This is the trusting confidence which gives light to the soul beyond all other spiritual revealings.

"The childlike faith, that asks not sight,
Waits not for wonder or for sign,
Believes, because it loves aright—
Shall see things greater, things divine.

"Heaven to that gaze shall open wide,
And brightest angels to and fro
On messages of peace shall glide
"Twixt God above and Christ below."*

* Keble's "Christian Year."

To receive God, in the humility of penitence and the submission of love, as the preferred controller of our moral natures, is the best, the only really successful method of extending our range of spiritual discernment. A purified heart is the most effective opener of the mental eye when divine objects are in the field of search.

“Faults in the life breed errors in the brain.”

Sin is the great obscurer of these higher heavens. Holiness goes up their vaulted pathways, and surveys with satisfying clearness many a marvel which will forever be in eclipse to the “natural man.” It believes God sympathetically, and sees his glory as sainted ones behold it yet more fully, where faith is turned to vision. And here spring the true fountains of human joy. How can the soul of the finite enter more intimately into the life of the Infinite, than through this trust reposed in God so lovingly, concerning these deepest and eternal interests of our being? If the Christian might have, for the asking, every mystery resolved which pertains to the Divine existence and acts, which involves his own well-being also, he might perchance not ask it, from the very pleasure of confiding some unexplained enigmas to one so benevolent, so wise, so loved as is our God and Saviour. Heaven may discover to us that the loftiest attainable joy of the saved is to be found in perfected knowledge of the ways of God; but earth can give the sanctified no purer happiness than is ministered to the believer through the power of faith. It too alone conducts to that larger understanding of this grandest of sciences which heaven promises. It is the gateway to the kingdom of God now and forever. It is our noblest honor as it will be our eternal benefactor. It puts us in fellowship with all right spiritual life, as it has the pledge from Christ of all good and glory.

“Believe, and show the reason of a man;
Believe, and task the pleasure of a God;
Believe, and look with triumph on the tomb.”

ARTICLE III.

ANTIQUITY OF MAN.

The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man, with remarks on Theories of the Origin of Species by Variation. By Sir CHARLES LYELL, F. R. S., &c. Philadelphia: George W. Childs. 1863.

THE public have been long familiar with the fact that certain discoveries have been made, which are thought by the savans to indicate an existence of man upon earth for a much longer period than common chronology has allowed. The public also, sometime before the book appeared, were aware that Sir Charles Lyell was preparing a volume which should embody and present these discoveries to the world. The volume has appeared, and already for some months, has engaged the attention of readers and the press. It is a very readable book, everything being put in Sir Charles' plainest and pleasantest style. And it is a debt of gratitude worthy of being mentioned, which the world owes to Hugh Miller, Lyell, Huxley, Tyndall, and a few others, that they have brought out science in so great degree from its cryptic lurking and concealment in hard terms and labored expressions, and set it forth to more general apprehension and acquaintance through a freer and more familiar style. The volume is an important one, both to the scientific and the religious world. If the discoveries it relates are to be received as the revelations of an antiquity of man hitherto unthought of and almost inconceivable, then a new and large advance has been made for science; it is made to occupy a higher and a wider platform by far than before; and theology is called to look about itself and see to its records.

The discoveries, as narrated by Mr. Lyell, relate chiefly to works of art found in Danish peat; the shell mounds, or Kjökken-mödding of the Danish Coast; the Swiss Lake Dwellings; the Delta and alluvial plain of the Nile; Bones found in ancient caverns; Flint Implements found in post-

pliocene sand and gravel in Abbeville and Amiens, France; and the deposits in the Brixham Cave, England. They are briefly as follows :

WORKS OF ART IN DANISH PEAT.

There have been found in hollows or depressions in the northern drift or boulder formation in Denmark deposits of peat from ten to thirty feet thick. Peat is of inappreciably slow growth. The lowest stratum, two to three feet thick, consists of swamp peat, composed chiefly of moss. Above this lies another growth, not made up exclusively of aquatic plants. In these two strata, lie trunks of trees, especially of the Scotch fir, often three feet in diameter, which must have grown on the margin of the moss-bogs and frequently have fallen into them. The Scotch fir is not now and never has been in historical times a tree of Denmark, and when introduced there has not thriven. The Scotch fir, according to the record of the peat, was succeeded by the sessile oak; and this still later by the common beech. The oak still exists in Denmark, but the beech has almost succeeded in supplanting it. From below a buried trunk of the Scotch fir was taken out a flint instrument of evident human manufacture—one of the knives or arrow heads of which we hear so much in this volume. By studying the discoveries made in the peat bogs, sand dunes, and shell mounds of Denmark, the Danish and Swedish antiquaries and naturalists have succeeded as they think, in establishing three successive periods of human antiquity, the stone, the bronze, and the iron ages. The stone is the age of flint implements; the bronze and the iron, the ages of those implements respectively.

SHELL-MOUNDS, OR KJOKKENMODDING.

At certain points on the Danish coast occur immense heaps of shells; oyster, cockle, and other shells of edible mollusks. Scattered all through these heaps, are flint knives, hatchets, and other instruments of stone, horn, wood and bone, with fragments of coarse pottery, but never any implements of bronze, or iron.

SWISS LAKE DWELLINGS.

In the dry winter of 1853—4, the inhabitants of a village on Lake Zurich undertook to raise the level of some ground and

turn it into dry land. The soil for this purpose they dredged up from the adjoining shallow water. The dredging operations disclosed the existence of a large number of wooden piles driven deeply into the bed of the lake, and among them, a great many stone hammers, axes, celts (stone hatchets) and other instruments. Nothing of metal was found, except an armlet of thin brass wire and a small bronze hatchet. Fragments of rude pottery were abundant, and masses of charred wood, supposed to have formed parts of the platform on which the wooden cabins were built. Also evidences of fishing gear, in the form of pieces of cord, hooks and stones used as weights. Subsequent to this, many sites were discovered. They occur in the large lakes of Constance, Zurich, Geneva, and Neufchatel, and on most of the smaller ones. Some are exclusively of the stone age, others of the bronze. The reasons for believing that these are the sites of ancient dwellings among the piles, are the discovery of so many of the articles and remains of common daily life, and the fact that habitations of the kind have existed within historical times. A kind of lake dwelling has likewise been discovered in Ireland, accompanied with similar evidences of human habitation.

DELTA AND ALLUVIAL PLAIN OF THE NILE.

Between the years 1851—4 some investigations were made in the Delta and valley of the Nile, under the auspices of the Royal Society of England to ascertain the nature, depth and contents of the Nile mud. The results of chief importance were obtained from two sets of shafts and borings sunk at intervals in lines crossing the great valley from east to west. One of these consists of fifty-one pits and artesian perforations, made where the valley is sixteen miles wide, about eight miles above the apex of the Delta. The other line, consisting of twenty-seven borings and pits, was in the latitude of Memphis, where the valley is only five miles wide. In these excavations, articles, or fragments of articles, such as jars, vases, pots, a copper knife, a small human figure in burnt clay, burnt bricks, etc., were brought up from all depths, even where the borings sank to the depth of sixty feet in the central part of the valley. If an average of six inches to the century be assumed as the rate of Nile mud deposit, a brick brought up from the depth of

sixty feet would be twelve thousand years old. One fragment of red brick was found at a depth of seventy-two feet.

CAVERN BONES.

In the discoveries mentioned thus far, the accompanying fossil shells and mammalia were of living species. We come now to some in which, while the shells are all recent, the mammalia are in part extinct.

As long ago as 1828, MM. Tournal and Christol found in the cavern of Bize, in the Department of the Aude, France, human bones and teeth, with fragments of rude pottery, in the same mud and breccia, cemented by stalagmite, in which land shells of living species were imbedded, and the bones of mammalia, some of extinct, some of recent species. In 1833—4, Dr. Schmerling of Liège, a skilful anatomist and paleontologist, published in two volumes, the results of several years' explorations and study of the ossiferous caverns which border the valley of the Meuse and its tributaries. He describes the contents of more than forty caverns. Many of them had never before been entered by scientific observers, and their floors were encrusted with unbroken stalagmite. Beneath the stalagmite, in the strata of mud and gravel, were found human bones and flint implements, associated, among others, with the bones of the cave bear, hyena, elephant, and rhinoceros. Many of the bones were much rolled and scattered, showing the action of water. No gnawed bones, nor any coprolites were found, showing that the caves were not the resort of wild beasts, and the bones were not brought there for purposes of prey. Whole skeletons were in no case found—only a few of the bones of the skeleton—most frequently teeth separated from the jaw, and the bones of the hand and the foot. Sometimes the bones of the limb or part of the body of an animal would be in such juxtaposition as to show that they must have been deposited while clothed with flesh, or at least enough of the muscle and ligament to hold them together. In the Engis cavern, about eight miles southwest of Liège, a human skull was found imbedded by the side of a mammoth's tooth. In the same cave, another skull was found buried five feet deep in a breccia, in which the tooth of a rhinoceros, several bones of a horse, and some of the reindeer occurred. It was singular that in the cave

of Engihoul, directly across the Meuse and in the other bank from Engis, while both caves abounded in the bones of extinct animals mingled with those of man, and while in the cave of Engis there were several human crania and very few other bones, there occurred numerous bones of the extremities belonging to at least three human individuals, and only two small fragments of a cranium. The like capricious distribution held good in other caverns, especially with reference to the cave bear, the most frequent of the extinct mammalia. Flint implements, of the rudest sort, were universal.

FLINT IMPLEMENTS OF ABBEVILLE AND AMIENS.

The most noted discovery relating to this question, and that which has brought into importance the foregoing, and taken the lead in public interest, is that of the flint implements in the post-pliocene deposit in the valley of the Somme, in France. As early as 1841, M. Boucher de Perthes observed and began to collect these implements, as they were dug out of the drift or deposits of gravel and sand whenever excavations were made in repairing the fortifications of Abbeville, or annually, as flints were wanted for the roads, or loam for making bricks. They were found from twenty to thirty-five feet beneath the surface, and associated with the bones of the elephant, rhinoceros, bear, hyena, stag, ox, horse, and others. These implements were rudely formed arrow-heads, knives, and hatchets, made by skilfully striking off chips from a flint pebble till the desired form was attained. They appear to be precisely similar to the arrow-heads, etc., used by the aborigines of this country, and frequently found in New England and the West. The same discovery was made by Dr. Rigollot at Amiens, forty miles below Abbeville, in the same Somme valley. The implements were found in both places in considerable abundance, and Dr. Rigollot and M. Perthes both published full accounts. The fact was especially noted that it was not in vegetable soil, nor in the brick earth with land and fresh water shells next below, but in the lower beds or coarse flint gravel, usually twelve, twenty, or twenty-five feet below the surface, that the implements were met with.

BRIXHAM CAVE.

Brixham is a town in Devon, England, near Torquay, upon the sea coast. In 1858 the discovery of a suite of caverns was made by the accidental falling in of a roof. At present five external openings are exposed to view in the steep cliffs and sloping side of the valley. At that time they were blocked up with breccia and earthy matter. Immediately it was thought best to have a thorough investigation made. Accordingly the Royal Society made grants toward defraying the expenses, and a committee of geologists was charged with the care and responsibility of the investigations. Geologist Pingelly was placed in superintendence, and the excavations of the different galleries were carried on with the greatest care. All the fossils taken from the subterranean fissures and tunnels were labelled and numbered; and a journal of the progress of the work was kept, and in it recorded with scrupulous care the geological position of every specimen. The floor of the main gallery was ninety-five feet above the level of the sea, and sixty above the bottom of the adjoining valley. All the passages exhibit the action of running water, and some of them seem to have been mostly, if not altogether, excavated by it. The united length of the five galleries which were excavated amounted to several hundred feet. They were sometimes filled up to the roof with gravel, bones, and mud, but occasionally there was considerable space between the roof and floor. The latter, where there were fissures through the roof, was covered with stalgmite; otherwise, usually there was no such incrustation. The general succession of deposits was this:

1. At the top, a layer of stalgmite, varying in thickness from one to fifteen inches, and sometimes containing bones — in one instance a reindeer's horn, and in another an entire humerus of the cave bear.

2. Next below, loam or bone earth, of an ochreous red color, from one foot to fifteen feet in thickness.

3. At the bottom of all, gravel, with many rounded pebbles in it, probed in some places to the depth of twenty feet without being pierced through, and being nearly barren of fossils, it was left for the most part unremoved. The mammalia obtained from

the bone earth consisted of *elephas primogenius*, or mammoth; *rhinoceros tichorhinus*; *ursus spelæus*; *hyæna spelæa*; *felis spelæa*; —cave bear, cave hyæna, and cave lion respectively; *cervus tarandus*, or the reindeer; a species of horse, ox, and several rodents, and others not yet determined. No human bones were obtained anywhere during these excavations, but many flint knives, chiefly from the lowest portion of the bone earth. Mr. Lyell remarks:

“Such knives, considered apart from the associated mammalia, afford in themselves no safe criterion of antiquity, as they might belong to any part of the age of stone, similar tools being sometimes met with in tumuli posterior in date to the era of the introduction of bronze. But the anteriority of those at Brixham to the extinct animals is demonstrated not only by the occurrence at one point in overlying stalagmite of the bones of a cave bear, but also by the discovery at the same level in the bone earth, and in close proximity to a very perfect flint tool, of the entire left hind leg of a cave bear. . . Every bone was in its natural place, the femur, tibia, fibula, ankle bone, or astragalus, all in juxta-position. Even the patilla, or detached bone of the kneecap, was searched for, and not in vain. Here, therefore, we have evidence of an entire limb not having been washed in a fossil state out of an older alluvium, and then swept afterwards into a cave, so as to be mingled with flint implements, but having been introduced when clothed with its flesh, or at least when it had the separate bones bound together by their natural ligaments, and in that state buried in mud.”—p. 100.

These are the discoveries, and from them as data, Mr. Lyell argues the indefinite antiquity of the human race, an antiquity of tens of thousands of years at least, and perhaps of hundreds of thousands. Do they prove it?

One having little knowledge or experience in that line in which Sir Charles Lyell so greatly excels, is hardly authorized to say no. Sir Charles is surely not a dishonest man, a neophyte, or a mountebank in science. He could not easily be practised upon in a geological question, nor would he practise upon others. His life has been one of geological research, and his object in that research simply fact. The facts in this case no one can question. And when once such man as he has pronounced, from his own observation, upon their geological character, no one can question them as geological facts. When

Mr. Lyell tells us that any deposit or discovery belongs to the post-pliocene, or any other, we may well be satisfied. There is no higher or better authority.

There are reasons, however, which seem to us sufficient for rejecting the conclusions, while we allow the facts. They are briefly the following.

1. The age of deposits is established by analogy, which involves too much assumption. It is assumed, for instance, that the rate of river-delta deposits is in general the same. It is found by experiment that the river Nile throws down a certain amount of inundation mud each year. It is assumed that that has been its rate from the first; and therefore when a boring reaches the depth of sixty or seventy feet, and yet only inundation mud is found, a simple arithmetical computation is made and its age declared; and if remains of human workmanship are found at that depth, it casts no suspicion upon the conclusion, but proves the antiquity of the race. Now, evidently, the rate of deposit of a few years at the present time may not be, and in all probability is not, the rate of earlier years, especially of the earliest. When a river was ploughing out its channel, on the first upheaval of a country from its ocean bed, it must have borne great quantities of soil in its current, to deposit where the waters became still or moved slowly. It would seem natural, as a river grew older, that the material which it could take up in its course, would diminish in quantity. How can there be in the course of the Nile that material to-day to be taken up by its current, which there was forty centuries ago? In some places it has found a rocky bed, and from those places, as fast as the bed has been reached, the supply has practically ceased. And although Mr. Lyell states that everywhere in these sections the sediment passed through was similar in composition to the ordinary Nile mud of the present day, except near the margin of the valley, where thin layers of quartzose sand, such as is sometimes blown from the adjacent desert by violent winds, were observed to alternate with the loam (p. 34), it is not easy to understand how the deposits in the Nile valley must not be greatly affected by the desert sand. Desert sand has filled in many feet deep in the vicinity of the pyramids at Ghizeh, at Denderah, and at Luxor, the first and second of these being

upon the west and the third upon the east side of the river. The disclosure of many of the ancient ruins upon both sides of the river, has been at the cost of a vast amount of sand excavation. Mariette's excavations in 1852 in front of the Sphinx, near the pyramids, were so extensive as to disclose a paved dromos, leading to a large wall, which seemed to have formed a court around the Sphinx. The pavement was twenty-four feet below the top of the wall. In 1858, only six years later, this dromos was covered again with sand.* If sand has been laid to such depths upon the banks of the river by the wind, how can the river itself have escaped receiving vast quantities? How can it be that the valley deposits are not in considerable proportion wind-brought desert sand?

Mr. Lyell notices the suggestion that the Nile has wandered to and fro over its valley, undermining its banks on the one side, and filling up old channels on the other; and answers, that "in historical times the Nile has on the whole been very stationary, and has not shifted its position in the valley." But there is certainly some evidence to the contrary. The Eastern or Pelusiæ arm of the Nile is now a mere canal, but it is commonly supposed to have been formerly navigable for fleets. This opinion, Professor Robinson says, (*Bib. Researches*, Vol I., App. note xii,) is based upon a passage in Arrian, where he is describing the expedition of Alexander against Memphis. From Pelusium, Arrian says, Alexander ordered part of his troops to sail with the fleet up the river to Memphis; while he with the remainder marched through the desert to Heliopolis, having the Nile on the right hand. *Arr. Exp. Alex.* 3: 1. 4. It does not certainly follow from this that the Pelusiæ arm of the Nile was then navigable, and that Alexander's fleet did sail up it; but so it has always been understood, and the view gains probability from the fact that Lake Serbonis, east of Pelusium, well known in ancient times, has become wholly dry land. *Encyc. Brit.*, Art. Egypt. If then, this is true, certainly great changes have been going on with regard to the bed of the Nile.

It will be remembered that Cairo was founded about A. D. 969. "At the time and long after Cairo was founded, the Nile ran more to the eastward, as Mr. Lane has shown, under its

* Austrian Lloyd's Hand Book for Egypt, p. 68.

western walls.* The space between Cairo and the Nile varies between a mile and a mile and a half in breadth. And this variation in its course the Nile has made in less than nine hundred years. In other words the Nile is constantly moving to and fro across its valley and has been always running its great furrows through the soil of its delta, and turning to the bottom whatever has lain at the top. Would it be surprising, then, if some of the fragments of pottery which have been found at depths of sixty and seventy feet, were even of Roman manufacture, as has been asserted by some? Mr. Lyell himself remarks that the amount of matter thrown down by the waters in different parts of the plain varies so much, that to strike an average with any approach to accuracy must be most difficult, (p. 37,) and yet proceeds at once to assume an average of six inches to the century. When we take, however, this variation into consideration, and remember also the variety of agencies which have been at work — the earthquake power by which Cairo was once nearly destroyed, (*Encyc. Brit. Art. Cairo*); the geological change of level by the subsidence of the coast along the Mediterranean, and the elevation of the region about Suez; and that overwhelming flood of the Nile which must have occurred when it burst its rocky barriers at Sibilis, sometime between the twentieth and fourteenth centuries B. C., (*Encyc. Brit. Art. Egypt*), the basis for any important argument as to the antiquity of the remains found in the Delta, seems very slight. Is not the whole theory of the antiquity of man from discovered bones and implements based upon the hasty and false assumption that the changes of nature in all the past have been as gradual as they are in the present?

2. It is argued, from the fact that the bones of extinct animals and man have been found together, that man is more ancient than has been commonly thought; not that the extinct animals are more recent.

For example, the demonstration in the Brixham cave, of the contemporaneousness of the extinct cave bear and the maker of flint implements is perfect. And the maker of all the flint implements is unquestionably man. No one who has once seen the relics of our own aborigines will question it for a moment, and

* Rawlin. Herod., vol. II., p. 6, note signed G. W. (Sir Gardiner Wilkinson).

it would seem that no one could question it, who thinks for a moment what the effect of the collision of rocks in running or dashing water is, that it gives more or less a rounded shape. But does this prove at all that man is any older than he has been usually thought before to be? No more than it proves that the cave bear is more recent than has been supposed. Has the limit in time to which these extinct animals have come down been determined? By no means. Then we cannot prove anything as to the antiquity of man because in any case their remains are found contemporaneous. The only thing proved is, that they were contemporaneous. If there is more reason to think man recent, and more reason to think that his age is known, then the weight of argument lies on the side of the recentness of the extinct animals, and not on the side of the antiquity of man. This, Mr. Prestwick, a name frequently quoted by Mr. Lyell, confesses. He says, as quoted by Mr. Dana, (*Manual of Geology*, p. 582,) "The evidence, as it at present stands, does not seem to me to necessitate the carrying of man back in past time, so much as the bringing forward of the extinct animals towards our own time; my own previous opinion, founded on an independent study of the superficial drift or pliocene (post-tertiary) deposits, having likewise been certainly in favor of this view." That animals have become extinct within historical times we know; (the dodo, and moa of New Zealand, the *æspiornis* of Madagascar, etc.), and that any became extinct before historical times, or what is the same thing, without being mentioned in history, is, in itself, little evidence as to the antiquity of their extinction. And it is difficult to believe that the *elephas primogenius* has been long extinct, when in some localities its remains are found in abundance on the surface of the ground, or dredged up by fishermen in no great depth of water near the coast, (Dana, *Man. Geol.* p. 560,) and when at the beginning of this century one was found imbedded in ice at the mouth of the river Lena, retaining the wool on its hide, and being so perfectly preserved that the flesh was eaten by the dogs. *Ibid.*, p. 561.

3. The disregard of historic verities. We do not forget that Mr. Lyell is looking merely to the 'testimony of the rocks.' He is not looking up an argument for the antiquity of the race

from any and every source. Nevertheless, in coming to his conclusions, he is bound to respect, and not override the testimony of history. Plainly, if history could have thrown any light on the lake dwellings of Switzerland, it would not have been going out of his way to consider what it had to say. It is possible that history might have had something to say about peat bogs, and have been able to explain why a flint implement should be found lying beneath a trunk of Scotch fir, and thirty feet of strata in Danish peat; or about the elevation and subsidence of coast line; and have thrown some light on the remains of a Norwegian hut, found beneath sixty feet of marine strata.* If so, Mr. Lyell would doubtless have availed himself of it.

Now there is a historic verity which, antiquated as the idea may be, may have had something to do with some of these geological appearances, especially with those at Abbeville and Amiens. We refer to the Noachian Deluge. The day is indeed past when all marks of diluvial violence in the upper strata of the earth's surface can be ascribed to the Flood. The church has learned from science that other agencies have been at work, and has learned now, when a marine shell is found in a stratum a hundred or two hundred feet above the level of the sea, not to look upon it as a relic, or decisive evidence of that remarkable event. Still the Noachian Deluge is a historic verity.

"The fact of a deluge which once destroyed the whole race, with the exception of a few individuals, is one of the best proved events in all past history. It is sustained by an array of evidence as strong as is possible in regard to an event which lies so far back of all written memorials and more impressive than mere documents could furnish. It has been branded into the memory of the nations, and has come down from time immemorial in all parts of the globe." Professor Bartlett.† The case is admirably summed up in the section from which this quotation is made. "A survey of all these traditions," existing in the different nations, "assures us that the flood was an historical event which had struck deep root in the

* "The wooden frame of the hut, with a ring of hearthstones on the floor, and much charcoal were found, and over them marine strata more than sixty feet thick. Some vessels put together with wooden pegs, of anterior date to the use of metals, were also imbedded in parts of the same marine formation, which has since been raised, so that the upper beds are more than sixty feet above the sea level, the hut being thus restored to about its original position relatively to the sea."—p. 240.

† Art. on the Historic Character of the Pentateuch, Bib. Sac., April, 1863.

memory of the nations; that the recollection of it extended from Armenia to Britain, and from China across eastern Asia to America; and that the biblical narrative of this event, in its freedom from all mythological and merely national elements, is the most faithful and purely historical representation of a tradition which had spread through all the nations of the world." Delitzsch, as quoted by Professor Bartlett.

Now, we submit whether, since there exists such a truth in history, such geological appearances as those of the post-pliocene in the valley of the Somme may not possibly be attributed to it: and if only possibly, yet whether it is not preferable, more in accordance with sound reason, and demanded indeed by the weight of probabilities, to so attribute it, or even to attribute it to some supposed cataclysm, rather than impinge upon other historic verity? There are the marks of cataclysm in all the deposits where flint implements have been found. This bed is gravel, or sand and gravel. It is a great and violent force which moves large bodies of gravel, a force which does not admit of the regular deposition of the finer loam and mud. Waters, moving like torrents, and glaciers, are the only forces which can transport gravel masses. Mr. Lyell does not attribute the formation in the valley of the Somme to glacial action. It is then to be attributed to the action of water. These implements and bones were laid here by a power which rolled and mingled gravel, sand, bones, and implements together. This gravel was not deposited as fine loam is deposited. These implements did not find their places by settling down quietly through water. Some cataclysm is therefore to be sought for. No other origin will satisfy the demands of the case. The Noachian Deluge was a cataclysm which once overwhelmed the whole known or inhabited earth. How then is that deluge out of the limits of consideration? We do not maintain that the explanation of the phenomena at Abbeville and Amiens is to be found in the deluge; but we do not see how it is not possible for the explanation to be found there; nor how the man of science, searching for the explanation, can at all suffer himself to pass by that notable fact without a consideration.

It will be seen that Mr. Lyell does not rest the antiquity of the relics upon their geological position, although he calls it

post-pliocene. Their geological position, from the nature of the case, the evident marks of dislocation, is an uncertain one. Nothing can be determined from it. He rests their antiquity really upon their association with the bones of extinct animals. The whole question really is, the antiquity of those bones.

These are the difficulties that occur to one carefully reading Mr. Lyell's volume. The conclusion that man is tens or hundreds of thousands of years old is hasty, and to say the least of it, according to the Scotch verdict, "Not proven." The weightiest arguments are those of the flint implements of the Somme. From Mr. Lyell's own presentation, it is not difficult to see, that the time of their deposit may not have been so very distant. No carboniferous strata cover them, not even any of the tertiary. They lie in a disturbed, dislocated deposit, immediately beneath the stratum of surface soil. Mr. Lyell calls it post-pliocene, a very good name, but it may have been very *post*.

As for the bone caverns, especially the post-pliocene burial place of Aurignac, they have very little weight in the scale; and the lake dwellings less still. The bone caverns and the lake dwellings are indeed not historical. Not a trace is to be found in any archives, or on any written page regarding them. But have we any pre-Roman history of those regions? Suppose we had a history of all the peoples which have inhabited Europe. Might it not possibly tell us of times when they used flint implements, dwelt in lake dwellings, and used caves for burial places; and when moreover, great mammoths and rhinoceroses and bears, and other animals long since extinct, roamed the land, and when great geological changes were taking place, perhaps those which filled the Brixham underground galleries with gravel and organic remains? To prove by the absence of testimony is a long and roundabout road. It is not easy to say how long it took to bring about changes, where there was no eye to see, and no hand to record; nor how long ago an animal became extinct which no people of letters ever saw, and marks of which, perhaps, special causes have been in operation to erase. One of the extinct animals which Mr. Lyell mentions as a favorite food of the ancient people, the wild bull, he frankly says was seen by Julius Caesar, and survived long after

his time. Can any one say that the *elephas primigenius* and others had then long been extinct? We want to see very much the argument which proves these animals long extinct. The case, as it now stands, seems to have been made up in this way. The remains of these extinct animals, having been found heretofore without any human remains associated, have been therefore adjudged to a high antiquity. Their age has thus been fixed. At last human remains are found associated; and now, instead of bringing their age forward, the age of man is put back. Mr. Lyell himself speaks of the rapidity of geological changes, and thus seems sometimes to argue against himself. For instance, he says, (p. 287),

“I see no reason for supposing that any part of the revolutions in physical geography, to which the maps above described have reference, indicate any catastrophes greater than those which the present generation has witnessed. If man was in existence when the Cromer forest was becoming submerged, he would have felt no more alarm than the Danish settlers on the east coast of Baffin's Bay when they found the poles, which they had driven into the beach to secure their boats, had subsided below their original level. Already, perhaps, the melting ice has thrown down till and boulders upon those poles, a counterpart of the boulder clay which overlies the forest bed in the Norfolk cliffs.”

How many such admissions would it take to be fatal to any argument for the high antiquity of man?

But suppose the antiquity of man reasonably proved; suppose the testimonies multiply and appeal with such force to reason, that aside from the Bible, it cannot be denied, what then? Are we to give up our Bible? By no means. If a fault in chronology were proved, what would that be in comparison with the evidence that remains. If the paleontologists of every sort, the geologists, the anatomists, and the Egyptologists combined, should reasonably prove that the Adam of the race (they do not argue for an ante-Adamic man,) should be put back ten thousand or one hundred thousand, or five hundred thousand years, it would only, and at most, prove an error in chronology, and would not abate from all the positive testimony we have that the Bible is the inspired word of God.

On this supposition, all that we can do is to look to our

records again. If we have not read them correctly, in our new study and investigation new light will arise. We have been called to re-read our records and correct our reading, before. Once astronomy made the demand; and the church has been no more shocked at any assertions and demands made by science since, than she was by those made by Galileo and the pioneers of modern astronomy. But she gave her records a new reading, and to-day finds no difficulty in reconciling the statements of that record with the discoveries of the planetary science. A second glance showed the church that the inconsistency was only apparent. Geology next made the demand. It asked a longer period for the processes of creation than it had been thought the inspired account gave. The church looked to her records again. She found that without doubt she had lost the primitive idea of the Mosaic "day" of the creation, and that restored, she had no difficulty in reconciling the indubitable records of the "stony science" with scripture.

Such will always be the result. The two great works of God, Nature and Revelation, will only come into conflict when searched and explained by minds that are uncandid, and which God has not enlightened.

Meanwhile, the proper attitude of the Christian theologian and Newtonian lover of science is, patience. They can both afford to wait till science has advanced to a ground of unmistakable fact, and the light of truth shall beam unclouded from the pages of revelation.

ARTICLE V.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

"THE souls of the righteous being made perfect in holiness are received into the highest heaven, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies; and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torment and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day."—Presb. Conf. Faith.

THUS plainly do the standards of the Presbyterian church assert the doctrine of the righteous and the wicked, the former in a state of happiness, the latter in a state of misery, during the interval between the death of the body and the final judgment. And this faith has been, and is, the faith of nearly all evangelical Christians. The uniform testimony of the entire Protestant church in all its branches might therefore be appealed to as an argument in favor of the truth of this well-nigh universally admitted doctrine.

But, omitting all reference to human standards and philosophical arguments, except so far as may be unavoidable in the answer to certain objections, we propose in this article to exhibit as briefly and as clearly as in our power the teachings of the New Testament upon this subject.

If we mistake not they establish the doctrine asserted above, of the conscious existence of both the righteous and the wicked in a state of happiness or of misery, between death and the judgment. In proof thereof we refer first, to the absolute silence of the New Testament in reference to any other doctrine than that commonly received. This negative argument, or argument from silence, is the more convincing in proportion as we realize the importance of the subject under consideration, and the serious consequences connected with erroneous views on it. The neglect of Christ and his apostles to assert any other doctrine concerning the condition of the soul after death than that generally received is a strong presumptive argument in favor of its truth.

And we must remember that the Pharisees and Essenes of Christ's day believed in the immortality of the soul, its future conscious existence in a state of enjoyment or suffering, and in the final resurrection of the body and its reunion with the soul. On this point we have the explicit testimony of Josephus, who says of the Pharisees :

"They believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them, and that under the earth there will be rewards or punishments according as they have, lived virtuously or viciously in this life, and the latter are to be detained in an everlasting prison, but that the former shall have power to revive and live again." *Antiq. Jews*, XVIII. 1:3. Cf. *Jewish Wars*, Bk. II. 8:14. And of the Essenes, he says, they "teach the immortality of souls and esteem that the rewards of righteousness are to be earnestly striven for."

Tacitus also ascribes the same opinion to all the Jews.

"Animasque prælio aut suppliciis peremptorum æternas putant. Hinc generandi amor, et moriendi contemptus. Corpora condere quam cremare e more Ægyptio, eademque cura et de infernis persuasio." *Hist. L.* 5, c. 5.

Had not Christ admitted these common opinions respecting the future state, he would have intimated a contrary. But instead of teaching a doctrine inconsistent with these views, he opposed the Sadducean theory and defended that of the Pharisees. Had any great number of the Jews or any of the disciples of Christ believed that souls pass, after death, into an intermediate state at all resembling that expressed by the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory, or into a state in which new opportunity would be given for repentance, their opinions would have been referred to, and if true would have received the Saviour's sanction. That we find no reference in the New Testament to these doctrines is conclusive proof, as we think, that they were not current in Christ's day, or in the time of the apostles. It therefore belongs to those who question the truth of the common doctrine to show that the statements of the New Testament are at variance with it. This has been attempted.

By those who believe in the unconscious state of the dead and in the annihilation of the wicked, such passages as *Eccl.* ix. 5, "The dead know not anything," (*cf.* iii. 19; *Ps.* cxlvi. 4; *Isa.*

xxxviii. 18,) are quoted in proof; passages which evidently refer to the dead as ignorant of what is occurring in this world, and which determine nothing whatever as to their consciousness or unconsciousness, in the future state. Much stress is laid also on the pretended assertions in Heb. xi. 13, 39, 40, "These all died in faith, not having received the promises," that the ancient worthies were not rewarded at death, and that therefore no Christians are, though it would seem that very little thought might convince any one that the apostle is speaking of those "worthies" as being saved by faith in a Redeemer who did not appear till long after their death. They died in the faith of Christ though the promises of the gospel were never proclaimed to them in person.

Again, the dead are spoken of as asleep, as having "fallen in sleep," and are therefore, it is argued, unconscious. But to say that because death is likened to a sleep, there is no consciousness beyond the grave, is to beg the question, for it assumes that to be true which the best philosophers deny, that the mind ceases to think, or is unconscious in profound slumber. And suppose it were true that in deep sleep the mind is unconscious, is it not going too far to affirm on the strength of an analogy which may not hold good after death, that in a disembodied state the soul can have no consciousness? Vide 2 Cor. xii. 2—4.

Besides, the language of the New Testament is the language of common life, and is to be interpreted as words in daily use now are, and from the connection in which they stand.

The fact that death is called a sleep in the New Testament only proves that the outward resemblance between the two was observed and spoken of by Christ and his apostles, and can no more be appealed to as indicating their belief in the unconscious state of the dead, than the use of the word sleep now, can be cited as proof that he who employs it expresses thereby his faith in the assertion of consciousness in ordinary slumber. The opinions of men cannot always be determined from the language which they use in common life. Cicero was a firm believer in the soul's future conscious existence, (*De Sen. c. 23*), and yet he spoke of death as an everlasting sleep.

Those who disregard the general teachings of the Scriptures

can, of course, quote passages in proof of whatever theory they wish, especially when they overlook the fact that the same word is often used in different senses. Hence it is easy for believers in an unconscious state to defend their theory by reference to the use of the word death as denoting the destruction of the body, and therefore of the soul. Says a writer in the *World's Crisis*, (a Second Advent paper published at Boston,) Nov. 25, 1862, "No part of man is alive between death and the resurrection," and another, in a tract entitled the "Key of Truth" affirms that "Man's soul never outlives his body." The righteous and the wicked are alike unconscious after death, or rather cease to exist. At the judgment both are "raised" (recreated?) in order to be judged, the righteous to receive eternal life from Christ, the wicked to be annihilated to suffer the second death. It is difficult to see how the advocates of such a theory, a theory which raises men from the dead merely to kill them, and that with the most exquisite tortures, can consistently object to the common doctrine of eternal punishment.

But this strange materialistic theory might have been avoided if its authors had only observed that the word death is used in different senses in the New Testament, that sometimes it denotes the death of the body merely, as in Rom. vii. 2, where the woman is loosed from the law of her husband after he is dead; that sometimes it is expressive of a spiritual state, as in Eph. ii. 1, "dead in trespasses and sins" (cf. "dead to sin," "crucified to the world," etc.) a state which beginning in time will have its consummation in eternity; and again, in a sense more comprehensive still, that it denotes the penalty of sin, the results, the consequences of disobedience to the commands of God, as in Rom. vi. 23, "The wages of sin is death." (cf. v. 13, "alive from the dead"; and v. 21, "the end of those things is death.") *

But a more serious, and if well established, a valid objection to the common doctrine, is based upon the use of the terms *destruction*, *destroy*, *perdition*. These it is said denote the extinction of conscious existence. Annihilationists, therefore, lay great stress on Matt. x. 28, "Fear not them which kill the

* Vide Hovey's State of the Impenitent Dead, chap. 2; Bib. Sac., July, 1858; Hodge's Com. on Rom. vi.

body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy (*ἀποκτείνει*) both soul and body in hell, (*γέενν*).” Here, it is said, is a positive assertion that soul and body can both be annihilated. But while admitting the power of God to annihilate, if such be his will, we remark in answer to this objection that no ordinary, unprejudiced reader would think of making this verse teach any such doctrine. The theory is first formed, and the passage interpreted accordingly. And besides the parallel passage in Luke xii. 4, 5, “Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell,” shows that the casting into hell takes place after the destruction, the annihilation of the soul and body, which is impossible.

The advocates of the annihilation theory also quote Matt. x. 39, “he that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.” Instead of the word life in different senses in the two clauses, they assert that he who is not willing to suffer even bodily death for Christ forfeits his conscious being in the next life. The evident meaning of the verse is, he who submits to the loss of all things for Christ, even to the loss of physical life, shall inherit eternal life, while he who prefers worldly and temporal existence shall forfeit the happiness of the eternal state. Compare Matt. xvi. 25, Luke xvii. 33, John xii. 25, with Luke xviii. 29, 30.

They take comfort again from a passage in Peter, “The heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition, (*ἀνωκετα;*) of ungodly men.” 2 Pet. iii. 7. The perdition of ungodly men is here interpreted to mean their annihilation. But neither the connection in which the passage stands, nor the similar passage in 2 Thess. i. 8, 9, “In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power,” would favor such an

explanation. For (1) the wicked are represented as conscious at the time the punishment is inflicted, and (2) they are punished by being sent away from the presence of the Lord, being deprived of his favor, a punishment which would lose its efficacy and terror if the one on whom it was inflicted were annihilated. Besides it is described as everlasting, (*aiōrion*).*

But a fatal objection to a theory which rests on the use of the words destruction, perdition, etc., is that the root of the word from which these are derived, does not denote the annihilation of the person as being lost or destroyed. A Greek concordance will make this apparent to every one who will take pains to examine the subject. We quote a few passages. "Whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones, a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall no wise lose his reward." Matt. x. 42, cf. Mk. ix. 41. Lose here means to fail of obtaining. To speak of the reward as annihilation would be absurd. "What man of you having a hundred sheep if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost," (*ἀπολωλός*). Luke xv. 4, cf. v. 8. Would a search for an annihilated sheep be profitable? Compare Matt. xviii. 13, and Christ's application of the passage. "Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish," (*ἀποληται*) v. 14. "This my son was dead and is alive again, he was lost, and is found." Luke xv. 24. "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost," (*ἀπολωλός*). Matt. xviii. 11.

What meaning would these passages have, and others which might be quoted resembling them, if the word lost were interpreted to denote the destruction of the conscious being of the person, or the annihilation of the thing lost? And yet upon such a slight basis does this theory rest!

An argument in favor of the unconscious state is also drawn from the New Testament account of the final judgment. The righteous and the wicked are to receive their reward according to the deeds done in the body at the last great day. If sentenced or punished then here, it is asked, can the dead have

* For a farther examination of similar passages, vide Hovey's State of the Impenitent Dead.

been in a conscious state before? Does God punish men before he tries them? The last objection may be removed by remarking that the whole of the present life is a period of trial, and the first by conceiving of the judgment as the New Testament represents it, as a public declaration at the end of the world of a predetermined state. And again, though in figurative language, the dead are said to be awakened from their graves by the sound of the trumpet. This does not establish their unconsciousness, or, as some affirm their non-existence, but rather implies their continued existence, in a state in which they are able to hear the summons which calls them into the presence of God. Nor does the passage in Rev. xv. 5, "the rest of the dead," those who had worshipped the beast and had received his mark, "lived not again till the thousand years were finished," prove the unconsciousness of the dead. For the context affirms the conscious existence of those who had not worshipped the beast, and as both righteous and wicked are regarded by Adventists as in the same state, it is evident that their explanation of the passage cannot be true.

The catholic doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked is denied by Universalists and Restorationists of every class. The former descant upon the goodness and mercy of God, as though he could not be just as well as merciful, forgetting, seemingly, that this objection is as valid against the divine government over man in this life, as it can be in the next, for sin is punished here to some extent, if not to the extent which it deserves, and quote such passages as 1 Cor. xv. 22, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," and 1 Tim. ii. 4, "Who will have all men to be saved," and v. 6, "Who gave himself a ransom for all," passages which taken in their connection do not teach the doctrine of universal salvation, and which idea absolutely contradicts the plainest assertions of other parts of the New Testament; "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God," "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."

Restorationists, looking to the ultimate salvation of all men, either attempt to explain the positive statement of the New Testament in regard to the future condition of the wicked, as figu-

ative, symbolical language, by a rule which universally applied would destroy all confidence in the Scriptures, or find intimations of the possibility of repentance in the future life, even in the pardon of the hard-hearted servant, (Matt. xviii. 34, 35,) who, according to Olshausen, is not to be eternally punished, because he admits his indebtedness, and is therefore cast into prison only, till, convinced of his true state, he shows a capacity for love as much as for repentance! The words of John are a sufficient answer to such a theory, "The smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever." And Christ himself has said, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment."

The doctrine, however, which has done more than all others towards creating lax views upon future punishment, and which is entirely opposed to the common belief in only two separate states between death and the judgment, is the well-known doctrine of purgatory. Stripped of some of its more odious features it is related to every form in which the theory of the ultimate restoration of the wicked has yet appeared.

The authority on which the Papal doctrine of Purgatory rests, is two-fold — Scripture and Tradition. With the latter we have now nothing to do, for the purpose of this article limits us to a consideration of arguments drawn from the New Testament only.

In proof of the truth of their traditionary doctrine of a future state of purgation by fire, which may issue in the bliss of heaven, Catholics quote 1. Cor. iii. 15. "If any man's work shall be burned he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." But even if the expression, "so as by fire" is not proverbial, indicative of narrow escape, as reference to Amos iv. 11, "As a firebrand plucked out of the burning," (cf. Zech. iii. 2, Jude 23,) seems to suggest, the drift of the entire passage makes the interpretation which Romanists give to this text untenable.

The apostle is speaking of the work of Christian teachers and of the test to which it is to be put. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ," i. e., no man can provide a way of salvation which overlooks Christ as its author. Yet on a good foundation a perishable building may be erected. For, "if any man build upon this foundation," i. e.,

Christ, "gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every man's work shall be made manifest, for the day," the judgment day, "shall declare it because it [the day] shall be revealed by fire," shall be manifest with or in fire as its characteristic. "And the fire shall try, [test, prove] every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon," i. e., upon Christ as the foundation, "he shall receive a reward" for his labor, and for its results. But, on the other hand, "If any man's work shall be burned," because of inflammable material and so unable to stand the test of fire, "he shall suffer loss," even the loss of all that he has done, "but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire," i. e., with the danger and difficulty of a man who barely escapes with his life from the flames which have enveloped his house. There is no allusion here to a purifying process which the soul undergoes after death; it is the work of Christian teachers which is tested, and this testing takes place, not during an intermediate state, but at the day of judgment.*

The passage, however, in which Romanists have the greatest confidence, as establishing the truths of their doctrine of purgatory, is found in 1 Peter, iii. 18, 19.

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison."

This passage, it is asserted, indicates the employment of the soul of Christ during the three days in which his body lay in the grave. To determine the place to which his soul went (for Matt. xii. 40, "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth," refers to the body of the Saviour and not to his soul,) Romanists quote Acts ii. 27, "Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption," which is itself a quotation from the second Psalm, and which Peter applies to Christ to prove his divinity from the fact of his resurrection. The essential meaning of the verse is that the soul and the body of

* Hodge and Olshausen's Com. *in loco*.

the Saviour were not to be left separate. Death should have no power over them. The use of the word *hades*, here rendered hell, cannot be referred to as a term equivalent to purgatory, a place in which penance is paid for sin committed in this world, for it is generally employed to denote the state of the dead without regard to their condition, as all the passages in the New Testament in which the word occurs will show.* It is found only eleven times in the New Testament; three times among the words of our Lord, once in Matt. xi. 23, (cf. Luke, x. 15, the parallel passage,) "And thou Capernaum which art exalted unto heaven shalt be brought down to hell," where *hades* is contrasted with the word heaven to denote a state of the greatest degradation and abasement in opposition to one of exaltation and privilege, and again in Matt. xvi. 18, "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" where, says Dr. Alexander, *in loco* the phrase "gates of hell" is "a strong figure for death or destruction corresponding to "the gates of the grave," in Isa. xxxviii. 10, and "the gates of death" in Ps. cvii. 18, and is equivalent to saying that nothing shall "destroy the safety of the church erected on the rock here mentioned," and finally in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke xvi. 23, where it is affirmed of the former that "in hell, (*hades*) he lifted up his eyes," which no satisfactory interpretation can make to mean anything less than a place of torment, separate from the abode of the righteous. It is not a little remarkable that in the only instance in which Christ used the word *hades* to denote a state of suffering hereafter, he applied it to the abode of the wicked in contrast with that of the righteous, and how unlikely that he went to a place from which the soul of the beggar was delivered! The word is met with twice in Acts, in the speech of Peter in the chapter from which we have already quoted, and is to be explained as indicating the apostle's belief that David foresaw that God would not abandon his Son to the power of death. The use of *hades* in 1 Cor. xv. 55, "O death where is thy sting, O grave [*hades*] where is thy victory," cannot be appealed to by Romanists in support of their doctrine, for it is evident that there is here no reference to a state

* Dr. Alexander's Com. *in loco*, and Prof. Hacket's.

of suffering. The remaining passages in which the word occurs are in Revelation, i. 18, "the keys of hell and death;" vi. 8, "And I looked and behold a pale horse, and his name that sat on him was death, and hell followed with him," where death is personified as followed by his victims; xx. 13, 14, "And death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them." (How could they have been delivered up if they were annihilated?) "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire," passages which in no way countenance the Romish doctrine under consideration, for death and hell themselves, used by metonymy for their victims, are cast into the lake of fire after the judgment.

We are therefore brought back to the passage in Peter, not simply for information regarding the employment of Christ's soul during the period intervening between the crucifixion and the resurrection, but for the place to which it went. And here it should be remarked that whatever be the result of our investigations as to the meaning of this difficult passage, we have no right to allow a single ambiguous statement to weigh against the concurrent testimony of the entire New Testament, nor can we suppose that Peter, an inspired apostle, and one of the three most favored with his Master's intimacy, would, as some have suggested, either have used language in accommodation to the opinions of the times in which he lived, or have taught a doctrine which contradicts all that the other apostles have taught as concerning the future state; for were it true that a theory of an intermediate state from which the doctrine of purgatory is but the legitimate outgrowth, were prevalent in his day, an assumption by no means warranted by facts, Peter as an inspired teacher would have corrected that belief, as a belief fraught with serious and fatal consequences.

A glance at the original of the passage before us shows that our translators have disregarded the antithetical character indicated by *μὲν* and *δε*, of the two important clauses: "being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit." * We may render it as follows: "being put to death, indeed, in flesh, but being made alive, or quickened in spirit," the first clause re-

* Vide, Bib. Sac., Jan. 1862, for an instructive examination of this verse by the Rev. J. B. Miles of Charlestown, an Article of which we have freely availed ourselves.

ferring to Christ's bodily death, the second to his spiritual exaltation, to his increased spiritual power. As Mr. Miles has shown, the dative *σαρχι*, cannot be translated as the dative of agency, with reference to the Saviour's body, for that he was put to death by himself, by his flesh, is untrue. Nor can it be referred to mankind, the whole race, without violating the ordinary rules of speech.

The leading interpretations of this text are the following: (1) The oldest, most generally received, and at first sight, the most natural one, is that Christ, in a disembodied state, went and preached to the spirits in prison, i. e., to the souls either of unbelievers, or of believers, or of both, who had died before the flood: that these souls, (according to some the souls of the Patriarchs,) were waiting to have the message of the Son of God delivered to them directly, and that having performed this work while his body lay in the sepulchre, the Saviour arose from the dead, and afterward ascended into heaven.* The objections to this interpretation, even though sanctioned by some modern commentators of great repute, are (a) that it is at variance with the plain teachings of the rest of the New Testament, and (b) that it sanctions the fatal views of the Romanists and many unevangelical protestants, by holding out the prospect of a future state in which separation is possible.

(2) Bishop Leighton, and Prof. Brown of Edinburgh, (Bib. Sac. 1847) suppose "spirits in prison" to mean the souls of sinful men righteously condemned, i. e., sinners of every age of the church, and that being quickened in spirit refers to the quickening of the sinner's spirit in consequence of his penal sufferings, his bodily death, "being put to death in the flesh," by which an influence was exerted throughout the church, increasing and intensifying the earnestness of Christians in proclaiming "the way of life" to the lost. The work which Christ performed was therefore a spiritual one, accomplished through the agency of renewed men.

The objections which are commonly made to this interpretation are (a) that the phrase "spirits in prison" according to the New Testament usage, though common in the Old Testament, does not refer to sinners. They are never termed prisoners.

* For the history and the influence of this belief, vide Pearson on the Creed.

(b) The term *πνεύματα* denotes disembodied spirits, and not living men. (c) The time when these spirits lived on the earth, expressly stated, is "in the days of Noah."

(3) The interpretation proposed by Dr. Skinner, (Bib. Repos. Apr. 1843,) and now quite generally advocated, explaining "quickened in spirit" as before, to denote the spiritual fulness, above measure, with which Christ was filled in consequence of his vicarious work, makes "the spirits in prison" the souls of the antediluvians who repented not at the preaching of Noah, the agent through whom the Saviour, by his spirit, made known the conditions of eternal life. The text has been thus paraphrased: "Christ exerted himself by the spirit, through the ministrations of Noah when the deluge was at hand, and he then preached by his faithful prophet to the disobedient persons of that generation, whose disobedient spirits are now in the prison of hell bearing the just punishment of their incorrigible impenitence." This interpretation, in lieu of a better, would commend itself to our minds, though open to the charge brought against it of changing the collocation of the words of the original, and of being incongruous with the context, neither in harmony with nor suggested by it.

(4) A fourth interpretation, ingenious and plausible, to say the least, has been recently suggested. Bib. Sac., Jan., 1862. Its leading features are the following: (a) When Christ gave up the ghost on the cross, his spirit passed immediately into the spirit world, a place which from other parts of the New Testament we learn to have been paradise, or the presence of God and not the world of woe. (b) Though the work of atonement was then completed we are not to suppose that the spirit of Christ was inactive. It was quickened in consequence of the completion of his earthly work, and was engaged in quickening his followers on earth, the very same work in which the Saviour has been engaged since his ascension. (c) By "the spirits in prison" are meant the lost souls of men who lived in the time of Noah, and to whom, as cognizant of the great work which he had completed, Christ preached by way of example. This finished work "made proclamation" to those who had refused to repent at Noah's preaching, of the justice and mercy of God,

and strengthened their conviction of the righteousness of their doom.

In favor of this explanation it is claimed (a) that it gives no unusual sense to the word *κηρύσσω*, which both in the classics and in the New Testament signifies to make known, as a herald, by proclamation, without note or comment; (b) that it harmonizes with the context; (c) that it accords with the analogy of faith. It does not make Peter teach a doctrine foreign alike to the spirit of the rest of the apostles and that of the divine Master.

But whether we accept this interpretation in all its details, or not, the synopsis we have thus briefly given of some of the leading explanations which the passage has received, shows that we are not under the necessity of admitting the truth of the Romish doctrine of purgatory, in order to obtain a reasonable and even satisfactory meaning from Peter's words. Neither he, nor any of the apostles, lends any sanction to the theory of a future state of repentance, or to a period of purgation by fire.

So far therefore as we can see we have shown that the New Testament does not contradict the commonly received doctrine in regard to the intermediate state. If the objections we have considered were valid, they would have been urged in Christ's day. The silence of Christ and his apostles in regard to them is conclusive proof that they were not urged, and therefore were not believed. The negative argument in favor of the common doctrine, or the argument from the silence of the New Testament in respect to any other doctrine must be allowed its full weight, for on such an important subject as this we cannot receive anything not plainly taught by the inspired record.

Assuming, what is generally admitted to be true, that the language of the New Testament is the language of common life, and that many of the Saviour's words were suggested by the prevailing belief of the Jews in the immortality of the soul; and farther, that the knowledge of Christ and his apostles on the subject of a future state was not less extensive than that of the Old Testament saints, who believed in a future existence, as their common synonym for death, "going to one's fathers," and the laws which Moses made against necromancy, and the calling up of Samuel by Saul, abundantly testify, we may draw a

probable argument in support of the common doctrine of a future state, from the indirect teachings of the New Testament, as to the condition of both righteous and wicked beyond the grave, and from the doctrines to which the apostles gave especial prominence in their official labors.

(1) The constant existence and blessedness of the righteous during the intermediate state may be established from the following considerations.

(a) The account of the transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1-13, Mark ix. 2-9,) informs us that Moses and Elias were seen by three of the apostles talking with Jesus, which indicates not only a belief in, but the assertion of the conscious existence, and happy state of Moses and Elias.

(b) In the refutation of the Sadducean doctrine (Matt. xxii. 27,) concerning the resurrection, Christ adduces the case of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, affirming that God is not the God of the dead, of those whose souls have been annihilated, but of the living, those who were conscious at the very time when the Saviour was speaking.

(c) "Rejoice ye in that day, for great is your reward in heaven, for in like manner did their fathers unto the prophets," Luke vi. 23, (cf. Matt. v. 12.) The prophets are here spoken of as though they were alive and happy at the time when this exhortation was made.

(d) The visions of John, (Rev., chaps. iv. v. and vii.,) indicate not only a belief on his part in the consciousness, but in the blessedness of the righteous during the intermediate state as well as after it.

(e) The reward of the righteous is eternal life, in contrast with that "everlasting death" which is the portion of the wicked. Our limits forbid an extended quotation of the passages in which this is affirmed. The following will serve as examples :

"Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." John xvii. 2, 3. "And show you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." 1 John i. 2. "This is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life." ii. 25. "And this is the record that God hath given unto us eternal life, and this life is in

his Son." v. 11. "Because I live ye shall live also." John xiv. 19. "He that doeth the will of God abideth forever." 1 John ii. 17.

Do not these quotations, which might be almost indefinitely multiplied, prove that the life which the believer has through Christ shall never terminate? "Because I live ye shall live also." What is this but an assertion that the existence of Christ was the source and pledge of the existence of his followers? But could it be so if the life of the believer were broken off by an interval of we know not how many thousands of years, passed in unconsciousness? What sort of eternal life would that be which admits of such interruption?

To "drink of the fountain of the water of life," to wear "a crown of life," to "eat of the tree of life," to "receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away," and the blessedness of "the dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth;" i. e., from this moment onward forever, imply the continuation of consciousness and the enjoyment of great bliss in the state which intervenes between death and the judgment.

(2) The future state of the wicked is learned from those passages in which their condition is absolutely declared, and from those in which it is contrasted with the condition of those who believe in Christ.

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark xvi. 15, 16. The character of the condemnation here spoken of, is to be determined from its contrast with the salvation of the righteous.

"It is better to enter into life, halt or maimed, . . . than to be cast into everlasting fire," Matt. xviii. 8, (cf. v. 29, 30.) The meaning of this passage is more clearly seen by comparing it with the parallel passage in Mark ix. 43-49. "It is better for them to enter into life maimed, than having two hands, to go into hell, into the fire that shall never be quenched, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," a passage which declares on the one hand, that mortification and suffering here will receive their reward hereafter, while on the other, it asserts that those who submit to no self-denial will enter into hell, into gehenna, the place of torment; for it is thus used in every one of the twelve instances in which it is found in the New Testament, (vide Matt. v. 22, 29, 30; x. 28; xviii. 9;

xxiii. 15, 33 ; Mark ix. 43, 45, 47 ; Luke xii. 5 ; John iii. 6.) It is unquenchable fire, fire which cannot be put out, where torments never cease. And as if this were insufficient, it is added Mk. ix. 49, "For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt," which may be explained as affirming that every one shall be kept from annihilation, from the corroding, destructive agencies of fire, by fire, and like salt for purposes of preservation so that punishment may be inflicted for ever and ever. (Vide Dr. Alexander, *Com. in loco.*)

Fear not him who can kill the body only, but him who can destroy both soul and body in hell. Luke xii. 4, 5. If we compare this passage and others resembling it which represent the souls of the lost as in a place of torment, with the account in Rev. xiii. 8 ; xiv. 10, 11, of the condition of those who worship the beast between death and the judgment, and subsequently, (cf. xix. 20,) when the beast and the false prophet are cast into a lake of fire burning with brimstone, as compared with the state of those who have not worshipped the beast, xiv. 3, 7, 13 ; xv. 2, and with the condition of the angels that kept not their first estate, but are "reserved in everlasting chains" (*αἰδίοις*, a word elsewhere applied to the eternal power and godhead of Jehovah) "under darkness unto the judgment of the great day," (Jude 6) who must have been conscious or they would not have been placed under guard and bound, it will be evident that the unbeliever immediately after death and forever onward is in a state of conscious misery.

And "the spirits in prison" to whom Christ preached, 1 Pet. iii. 19, must have been conscious at the time of the crucifixion, and if conscious then what proof that they will not always remain so, or that they will ever be annihilated?

The scene of the final judgment sheds light upon the intermediate state of the soul, Matt. xxv. 41—46. (Compare the parable of the tares, Matt. xiii. 24—30 ; 36—43). Those on the left hand are sent away into "everlasting punishment," which is equivalent to gehenna, or "unquenchable fire," the strongest possible terms which can be employed to set forth eternity of torment, "prepared for the devil and his angels," fit subjects of the kingdom of darkness, while the righteous enter into life eternal. The terms indicating the character of the reward and

the punishment given, assert an entrance upon a state which can never end, and imply that, at the time when the final decision is made, both those on the right hand and those on the left, are conscious, and therefore favor, if they do not necessitate the conclusion that both parties have been in conscious misery or happiness during the whole period which has elapsed since their bodily death, for no mention is made of the exertion of any power to excite them out of a lethargic or unconscious state, nor is there the slightest allusion to any penance which they have paid since entering upon the intermediate state. The doom pronounced is based upon sins committed on the earth. If another state were to come into the account, why is there no mention of it?

From the passages thus cursorily examined we conclude, (a) that the righteous and the unrighteous are conscious during the intermediate state; (b) that at death they enter immediately upon that state of "life" or "death" which is their respective portion; (c) that there is no penance in the world beyond the grave; (d) that the judgment is a public declaration of a final and unalterable state, though that state might have been fixed long before.

(3) The common doctrine of the intermediate state is inferred to be true, from the doctrines which the apostles made prominent in their official labors.

(a) Regeneration is everywhere represented as a necessary preparation for heaven. The Saviour's assertion that "except a man be born again he cannot enter the kingdom of God," is repeated over and over again in different forms in the writings of the apostles. John describes it as being "born of God," and as passing from "death to life," and Paul affirms that "in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature."

(b) The regenerate, "being justified by faith" are united with Christ. They partake of his divine life. Because he lives they live. His work, his sufferings and death, secures their life. And the life they live is eternal. It cannot be interrupted even by death, for where Christ is his followers are. "I go," he said to his disciples, "to prepare a place for you . . . that where I am there ye may be also." The church on earth and

in heaven are one, and Christ is its head. To suppose that those who have "fallen asleep in Jesus" continue unconscious till the judgment, would make much that the apostles have said meaningless. "Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed," Rom. xiii. 11, which implies that Paul was looking forward to its consummation at death. "Our light afflictions are but for a moment." "Looking for that blessed hope and glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ." "Ye are come unto Mount Zion . . . to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born . . . to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant." The apostles anticipated with joy the termination of their earthly career. They were persuaded of their union with Christ, and that nothing could separate them from him, who ever lived to make intercession for them; so that they could say, as they believed with truth, "whether we wake or sleep, we shall live together unto him." 1 Thess. v. 10.

The sufferings of the wicked are also described precisely as they would have been, if they were to begin immediately after death. The terms which express the character of these sufferings are such as would be employed to denote conscious, eternal misery. The wicked go into "everlasting death," into "unquenchable fire," "their worm dieth not." They are banished unto "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord." They are "cast into the bottomless pit," "prepared for the devil and his angels." These terms do not favor the doctrine of an "unconscious suffering" or of annihilation, but of unending, conscious torture. And these descriptions are given to the future state of unbelievers in order to induce men to seek to escape from the wrath to come, which is revealed against all manner of righteousness. For though a life of positive enjoyment might be desirable, yet to the sinful posterity of Adam, it would furnish a weak motive for resistance of sin, if the only penalty of transgression were unconsciousness till the judgment, and annihilation afterwards.

(c) The apostles admit the personality of Satan and of his angels. A kingdom is subject unto them. Those on the left hand at the judgment, prepared for them are sent away into

"everlasting death." Unless Satan himself is to be annihilated, of which there is no mention in the New Testament, the souls of the wicked will not be annihilated, and from the fact that the same term, "eternal" (*αἰώνιον*), is applied to the future state of the believer and the unbeliever, we infer the eternal existence of the wicked and consequently of their sovereign, their "father," who reigns over them.

(d) Christ's work is a complete and perfect work. Suppose the righteous are unconscious after death, and before the judgment. They lose the enjoyment which they would have taken during that period, had they been conscious. The work of Christ would have been more complete therefore if it had secured the happiness of believers during this period. To suppose that it did not, limits the value of the atonement, and contradicts the testimony of the inspired writers.

(e) The redeeming work of Christ is indispensable. This follows from the nature of justification and regeneration, as well as from express assertions of the New Testament. Christ was offered once for all, a ransom for many, that God might be just, and justify those that believed on him. But if penance for sin in this life may be paid beyond the grave, the death of Christ is unnecessary, for though his death might alleviate somewhat the pains of purgation, yet their endurance is of the nature of meritorious atonement, which not only detracts from, but renders the work of the Saviour unnecessary.

It is evident that our Lord and his apostles did not countenance the doctrines of annihilationists or lend their sanction to those who advocate the theory of the ultimate restoration of the wicked. If a man does not repent in this life there is no hope for him in the next. "Ye shall die in your sins," says the Saviour, "and whither I go ye cannot come." "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation," writes Paul to the Hebrews.

The exhortations and warnings addressed to sinners, and the consolations and encouragements held out to believers, by those who were judged "for the hope of the resurrection of the dead," who looked for a city that had foundations, who watched "for the glorious appearing of Christ," trusting that if he lived they who had received life from him should live also, who expected

to reign with him, sitting on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel, could have had no sympathy which makes sin less heinous than it is, or which detracts from the perfection of that salvation through Christ, which, bought with his precious blood, is offered to all who are willing to receive it.

The argument against the Sadducees, in favor of the resurrection and for the immortality of the soul, the transfiguration, the account of the final judgment, the doctrines which the apostles proclaimed concerning the necessity of the new birth, and in reference to the unity of Christ and his followers, the encouragement which the Saviour held out to them, that after his departure he would send them another Comforter, that he himself would be with them to the end of the world, thus implying his conscious existence, which none are so irreverent as to deny, (though if believers are united with Christ in this life, and are with him in the next, and are yet unconscious, the awful doctrine of the Saviour's unconsciousness must be affirmed,) constitute so strong a probable argument in favor of the received doctrine concerning the future state, as to almost warrant us in unhesitatingly affirming its truth.

But we have stronger evidence than we have yet adduced in favor of the truth of this doctrine, in the positive statements of the New Testament in reference to the condition of the righteous and the wicked between death and the final judgment.

(1) The account of the repentance of the thief on the cross proves something as to the place and condition of the righteous. "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Luke xxiii. 43. The question to be here answered relates to the meaning of the word "paradise." The elements of which it is composed do not determine its meaning, nor can it be ascertained with perfect accuracy from its historical associations. It is a word of Eastern, perhaps of Persian origin, and denotes a pleasure-park, a place of great delight, and is applied by the LXX to the garden of Eden, and would therefore seem to be an appropriate term for a place, or a state of happiness and enjoyment. In the New Testament the word is met with but three times, once in Luke, in the passage already quoted, and once in 2 Cor. xii. 4, where it is used interchangeably with the third heavens, which were regarded as the abode of Jehovah

and into which Paul was caught up, and where he heard unutterable words, (a passage which, it may be observed in passing, proved that the apostle thought it possible for the soul to exist apart from the body,) and again in Rev. ii. 7, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God," i. e., in the place where God's presence is manifest. A comparison of these three passages has produced a general conviction that paradise is a place of conscious existence and happiness, a conviction which is strengthened by the knowledge that Christ went after his death to the right hand of God, or, as he told his disciples, "to my Father and your Father." Yet some have attempted to explain the passage in Luke as not inconsistent with the doctrine of an unconscious state, by supposing that the Saviour meant to say to the thief on the cross that his sleep after death would pass so quickly that he would seem to himself to enter upon eternal joy that very day—an interpretation not only forced and unnatural, but inconsistent with the Saviour's character.

(2) The parable of the rich man and Lazarus sheds some light upon the future condition of the sinful and the holy. Its drapery is not to be explained away as meaningless. Without entering into a discussion of the meaning of the several parts of the parable, it may be safely asserted that it proves the following points, the more clearly that they are not the prominent features of the parable.

(a) The existence and consciousness of angels, for they carried Lazarus to Abraham's bosom. If angels, who are sent to be ministering spirits unto the heirs of salvation, exist before the judgment, why may not the souls of men? (b) A place of torment and of happiness, the latter expressed by the term "Abraham's bosom," the former by the term *hades* or *hell*. (c) That the torment endured is unutterable. (d) That it can not be alleviated. (e) That there is no passing from one place or state to the other. (f) That there is no return to this world not even to warn others of the sufferings of "hell." (g) The justice of God, which finally rewards men according to their merits. Now if we remember that this parable represents the state of souls before the general judgment, we can hardly escape the conclusion that the souls of the wicked are in

conscious misery, while those of the righteous enjoy conscious bliss immediately after death.

(3) Stephen (Acts vii. 55, 56,) "looked up steadfastly into heaven and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said, Behold I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." This language admits of only one interpretation and that the most obvious — that Stephen believed that he saw what he affirmed, and if put to death, as he evidently expected to be, that he would be admitted into the presence of God and of Christ. Hence his prayer when the multitude rushed upon him to stone him, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit," and the certainty that the words of the historian, "he fell asleep," refer to bodily and not to spiritual death.

(4) Paul (2 Cor. v. 1—9) was willing to be absent from the body, i. e., to have his soul separated from his body, that he might be present with the Lord, and so much did he long to experience this change, that in Phil. i. 21—23, we find him affirming that "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, (implying that he could live away from it, in the spirit,) this is the fruit of my labor; yet what I shall choose, I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ which is far better: nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you," language which requires us to suppose that the prospect of immediate joy excited in the apostle's mind a desire to enter upon it at once, though he knew that the feeble Christians to whom he was writing needed all his labors, and all the encouragements he could give them, to strengthen them in their faith, and to aid them in resisting their temptations.

Had Paul believed in an intermediate, unconscious state, would he have wished to die? Would he not rather have desired to live, that he might do the more for Christ, and that the period of his unconsciousness before the judgment might be the shorter? Compare the passages just quoted, with the revelation in 2 Cor. xii. 2—4, which brings to our knowledge the existence of such a place as heaven, into which one was caught up, most probably the apostle himself, a place of life and activity, for words unutterable were there heard, and we shall be

convinced that Paul expected when his bodily life was over, to enter into a state of conscious happiness in the presence of his Lord.

(5) Enoch and Elijah did not die. They were translated that they should not see death. Does the account of the transfiguration make it possible to suppose that Elijah was taken up into an unconscious state, and is it excusable to believe that the goodness of Enoch was rewarded by shortening his natural life, and by lengthening the period which he must pass in sleep, before he could enter into the anticipated joys of heaven!

And the victory which the worthies mentioned in Heb. xi. obtained through their faith, is not a victory which can be explained on the ground that an intermediate state of unconsciousness of uncertain duration must intervene between its acquisition and its enjoyment. (cf. Heb. xii. 1.)

Finally, in bringing this argument to a close, we should not fail to refer to the spirit of the New Testament as the strongest possible proof of the truth of the doctrine we defend.

The truth of this doctrine seems to be assumed throughout the New Testament. It is part of its texture, and it cannot be denied without weakening, and so taking away from the meaning of the word of inspiration.

Let one examine such portions of the Scriptures as the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v—vii:) the greater part of John; all in fact that relates to Christ's work — those passages which insist upon the necessity of preaching; which represent the loss of the whole world as nothing in comparison with the loss of the soul, those which are full of the earnestness of the apostles in the performance of their work: let one read the prayer of Paul in the beginning of nearly all his letters, for the spiritual welfare of those addressed, or the epistles of Peter, or the Revelation of John the Divine: let him see how little can be made of the sacred records on the theory that the righteous and the wicked pass into a state of unconsciousness, to continue till the judgment, after which the former are to be annihilated, or put into a state where penance is made: let him regard such terms as "devil," "Satan," "Beelzebub," "fallen angels," "everlasting punishment," as mere figurative expressions based upon the real foundations, and made use of only to influence men to seek for

immortality, rather than to suffer the endless nothingness of annihilation — and if not wholly carried away by the spirit of a false philosophy, which denies the truth of any part of the Scriptures, he will turn for relief to the ordinary evangelical doctrine of the soul's future, conscious, endless existence either in heaven or in hell. Without this doctrine there is no foundation on which to rest.

The spirit of the New Testament is a spirit of life eternal, never-ending life for all, for the righteous and the wicked, for the just and the unjust, a life of intimate union with Christ from henceforth forever, infinitely blessed, or a life of death, union with Satan, fellowship with the works of darkness, misery unutterable, in the torments of "unquenchable fire."

ARTICLE VI.

THE ENGLISH DISSENTERS.

EVERY age and every country has its own special occasions for high moral daring. That the occasion has not more frequently been answered by men qualified to turn it to account, must be reckoned among the chiefest misfortunes of the human race. How vastly different would have been the present aspect of our world, if the Daniels, the Esthers, the Luthers and the Washingtons had always been at hand when the emergency arose which demanded their service. How cheering is the light which one such spirit has flung over the pathway of the nations through all following time; and how dismal the darkness which has ensued when, because no such spirit appeared, the occasion has been lost to truth and liberty, and the twilight of a glorious morning turned into the shadow of death.

It is a less dazzling spectacle when the providence of God assigns a high moral position to an entire community; but it is fraught with issues far more extensive, and the disastrous consequences of failure are great in proportion.

The application of these remarks to the religious dissenters of England will not be understood as prejudging their ecclesiastical polity; nor yet their position relatively to the other Christian denominations; much less the character of the men, and their influence upon the religious destinies of their country. These will be among the subjects of our inquiry.

Assuredly it will not be denied by churchman or cavalier, that some degree of magnanimity belongs to the position upon which the English dissenters have taken up their stand, as among the great religious parties of the day. Voluntary churchmen side by side with the wealthiest and most powerful ecclesiastical establishment in the world; deliberately cutting themselves loose from all the advantages of university education, and political power, and the adhesion of the great, the mighty and the noble, in a country where all these things are of boundless regard; content to be stamped as vulgar and excluded from the ordinary social intercourse of the class of the community most distinguished for refinement of manners and high and varied mental culture; incurring, in many instances, large pecuniary sacrifices, by the loss of custom from those who, in this nineteenth century of the Christian era, can descend so low as to petty, pitiful persecution of a man for his religious belief; taxed equally with the churchman for the support of the churchman's worship from which they conscientiously separate themselves, and, under all these manifold disadvantages, building their own churches, supporting their own ministers, and establishing their own schools and colleges; yet steadfastly refusing all government patronage in every shape, and undertaking to demonstrate that Christianity has most of life and power when left to its own free action, unendowed and unrestricted; and that the people will be better educated when the state leaves the matter entirely alone:—assuredly there is something in this of true magnanimity, of noble moral daring, even if it is not entirely free from presumption and mistake.

The English dissenters are magnanimous men. They are occupying worthily a position which should command the high admiration of every one that has a soul large enough to discern true moral greatness wherever found, and to value it for its own sake. They are not accomplishing all that they claim for

their principles. They are not accomplishing all that, with their principles and their position, they might do. But they are doing enough to earn for themselves an honorable place on the page of their country's history. They are nobly bearing a hand in every great religious and philanthropic movement of the age, at the same time that they are practically solving problems in ecclesiastical polity in which the universal church is deeply interested, thus contributing, in their full measure, to shape the destinies of the world.

They are at least men into whose character, position, principles and influence we of New England have cause carefully to inquire. Descendants of the Puritans who remained at home in spite of Star Chamber and Smithfield fires, as we are of those who, for "freedom to worship God," were content to brave the perils of the deep and of the wilderness, their principles are mainly coincident with those which laid the foundations of this great Republic.

In calling these men the religious dissenters of England it will be perceived that the terms are used in their restricted and conventional, not in their more comprehensive sense. All who separate themselves from the communion of the Established church are dissenters in fact: yet the papists are never spoken of as dissenters, nor are they so in theory, holding, as they do, the union of the church with the state, only claiming for the church absolute and uncontrolled freedom in matters ecclesiastical—the plain meaning of which is, the supremacy of the Pope; or, in other words, the state subject to the church.

The Wesleyans also might seem to be included, yet they utterly and proudly repudiate the name of dissenters, though they are the largest body of religious separatists in all England, with an ecclesiastical polity of their own which is altogether peculiar; and affect a special sympathy for the church of England, at the same time that no others are treated with such unmeasured contempt by that arrogant hierarchy. The secret at once of the sympathy and the scorn is found in the fact that the devout churchman, who laments the absence of evangelical doctrine in the sermons of his own minister, but has not courage enough to attend upon the ministrations of our avowed dissenters, finds a convenient half-way house in the chapel of the kind

hearted Wesleyans, who are willing to call themselves churchmen for his particular accommodation. Thus we have seen the regular attendance at a Wesleyan chapel half made up of way-faring members of the church of England.

The Wesleyans contribute more largely to the support of foreign missionary operations than any other denomination, though in wealth their rank is not higher than the third or fourth. They have their own high schools and theological seminaries, in which they exhibit an excellence every year increasing. They have chapels and denominational day schools throughout all the land, with an immense aggregate income, entirely under the control of Conference, whose powers, extending to the affairs of every congregation in the kingdom, come as near to absolutism as can well be conceived. Their Buntings, and Stanleys, and Punshons and Arthurs are worthy successors of Wesley and Watson and Adam Clarke. One of the most remarkable men of modern days was Jabez Bunting, who died a few years ago, at a very advanced age. A man of masterly intellect and great statesmanship, a power in the pulpit and on the platform, he was the acknowledged chieftain of the English Wesleyans for a lengthened period. In the grand struggle which convulsed the whole Wesleyan body, some fifteen years ago, he was the champion of the conservative portion, in other words, of "Conference," and carried it triumphantly against the reforming wing, who contended that Jabez Bunting and his coadjutors had departed widely from the more simple and scriptural platform of John Wesley, their illustrious founder. The reformers included not a few men of decided power, as administrators and orators, well fitted for popular leaders; and the result of the struggle was—not a reform of the evils complained of, of course, when did such a thing happen?—but a secession of a large aggregate body of lay members and preachers, and a new organization, which claimed to return to the original Wesleyanism in church polity and discipline. Some men of mark as preachers were lost entirely to the denomination, and are now the pastors of prominent churches among the Independents in London and elsewhere.

A critic of no mean power in another denomination, said of Jabez Bunting, that he would have made a noble Prime Min-

ister if politics had been his profession. An autocrat in disposition, a tory in politics, and the Nestor of his denomination, his influence acknowledged no bounds. That influence lives in the impregnable strength of Conference after an assault, from forces within, as formidable as any it is likely to suffer for the next hundred years. It is a grand spiritual centralization, "a wheel within a wheel," controlling with an absolute will everything included in the enormous organization, to the very outward circumference. So long as there is strict and unquestioning subordination everywhere, all runs smoothly and pleasantly; but if it happens that a preacher is endowed with too much genius, or too much power of thought, or too strong a will, and all with a disposition to be free, he is pretty sure to find out that Conference has its Botany Bays, in the shape of very small and obscure congregations, to one of which he may be sent for a term, as a means of spiritual health.

We have said that Jabez Bunting was a tory; so are the Wesleyan ministers, almost in a body. The exceptions are hardly sufficient to justify the supposition of free individual thought in the matter. Neither do they always content themselves with the quiet recording of their own votes in a popular election. We remember an illustration. Theophilus Lessey, one of their most distinguished ecclesiastical chiefs and popular orators, having been repeatedly President of Conference, was wasting rapidly away with consumption, his tall, massive frame attenuated and bowing like a reed. In this condition he came, for change of air, to a beautiful watering place in the south of England, where we had the pleasure to make his acquaintance. It happened that during his stay the general election took place, in which was fought the great battle for protection which resulted in the complete overthrow of the Melbourne Ministry, by Sir Robert Peel and his party. Noble hearted and devout Christian man as he was, and his majestic frame greatly emaciated by disease that was hurrying him to his grave, Theophilus Lessey expressed his profound regret that he was not in his full health and vigor, so that he might throw himself, heart and soul, into the struggle, and lend the weight of his influence to the triumph of the tories. "A fellow feeling makes us wondrous kind." A son of Theophilus Lessey is now a successful preacher among the Independents in London.

Another religious sect comprised in the general body of the dissenters, is that of the Unitarians. They are a small and compact community, found chiefly in the large towns, and especially in the north of England. They are characterized by wealth, intelligence, great refinement of manners, and high social position. They display a princely munificence in philanthropic movements, particularly in charities for the poor immediately around them. Their reputation for commercial integrity is also high. They have several members in Parliament, and are treated with greater consideration by the leaders of the great aristocratic parties than any other religious body, except, perhaps, the Roman Catholics. They are earnest liberals in politics, yet it was the tory Lord Lyndhurst who concocted, a few years ago, the "Chapels' Trusts Bill," by which they were secured in perpetuity in the undisturbed possession of a goodly number of religious endowments in connection with places of worship which were originally orthodox, but, by some means, had passed into their hands. Their congregations, for the most part, are extremely small, though their ministers are men of good education, and accomplished manners, with no mean powers of oratory. In their ministrations they are quiet, little given to doctrinal discussions, dwelling rather on the great principles of Christian morality, with the not infrequent introduction into the pulpit of elegant literary essays, the repetition of which earns for them a high reputation as lecturers before Mechanic's Institutes. They are accustomed to hold on to the names of the denominations to which their chapels formerly belonged, as Presbyterian or Congregational. In religious creed they verge all the way from the earlier stage of lapse from orthodoxy to the dreary frozen waste of Theodore Parker and the *Westminster Review*.

The foremost place among their preachers must, unquestionably, be assigned to James Martineau, of Liverpool, the accomplished scholar, the elegant writer, and the singularly ornate pulpit orator. His audience "fit, though few," is of the élite of the great commercial emporium, cultivated, wealthy, and going to church in carriages of princely splendor. The Mercurius of the English Unitarians is W. J. Fox, Esq., the quondam Rev. W. J. Fox, preacher of Finsbury Chapel, city

of London, latterly member of Parliament for Oldham, and always a grand orator on occasions which draw the mixed multitude. We have not seen him of late; but it was a rich treat to hear him ten years ago. He had a large frame and portly form, with massive head, well set on ample shoulders. His thick iron gray hair was parted in the centre, and fell in heavy ringlets on his shoulders. His voice, sweet, and of great power, was managed with consummate skill. His style was elegant, yet remarkably simple and clear, and his manner rather quiet than otherwise. He spoke like a man perfectly at ease, and conscious of possessing a much larger power than he was putting forth. We heard him address one of the largest audiences that Exeter Hall could contain, on capital punishment of which he advocated the total excision from the statute book. His speech—full of sophistries—was brilliant in the highest degree. It was delivered in his own peculiarly self-retained and quiet way, yet the audience was wrought up to the highest pitch, and greeted sentence after sentence with thunders of applause, amid which he stood still and calm, like a great rock in the sea, when the waters are surging and foaming and dashing all around.

Mr. Fox will not owe his best fame to his pulpit deliverances, or his history as a pastor. His prayers were oratorical rhapsodies, of which "Jehovah, Jove or Lord," might have been the object. His text was from the Bible, Poor Richard, Shakespeare, or an old almanac, and the sermon [?] classical, brilliant, witty, and intensely pagan, honoring the gods somewhat, but man a great deal more. We recall among his characteristic texts the popular proverb, "Honesty is the best policy." The particular aim of the discourse was to prove that the proverb is not true!

As relates to doctrinal creeds the English Unitarians seem more intent to undermine those of others than to make any very distinct assertion of their own. As elsewhere they allow large liberty of unbelief, and are illiberal only toward those who are positive and earnest in the profession of a well-defined religious faith. They have too little warmth and unction to attract the masses, while the established church carries it against them with polite and learned sceptics, who find it more comfortable

to send forth their attacks on Moses, and their "Essays and Reviews" from luxurious cloisters and bishops' palaces, than from the simple retreats of unendowed nonconformity. Hence Unitarianism can hardly be reckoned a power among the religious bodies of England.

The Quakers are rapidly waning in England, though they have still considerable numbers, and great wealth and respectability in the aggregate. Foremost in the march of philanthropy; able, earnest, untiring advocates of temperance, peace, and emancipation; in religious matters they are too quiet, not only to make proselytes from other denominations, but even to retain their own members: the consequence of which is that the children of the Frys and Gurneys and Buxtons pass frequently into other communions, and especially into the church of England. They are very intelligent, preëminent for their worldly wisdom, and universally respected for general worth and good citizenship. They have their extremely plain meeting houses and their places of burial connected with them. They are regular in their attendance on Sabbath worship, which is, for the most part silent of late years, no preachers of eminence having appeared among them recently. If a member of a congregation is moved to talk, whose gifts do not please nor edify, he is pretty sure to have a gentle hint to keep still, since they greatly prefer utter silence to poor preaching. If he pleads that the Spirit moves him to talk, the reply is that the Spirit must not move him to talk. In dress they eschew the world of course, yet none wear richer silks or finer broadcloths or more expensive beavers; while they manage to impart so much of elegance and grace to their peculiar bonnets that the beautiful young quakeresses need have no fear to fail of making conquests, even if they should be reduced to the necessity of looking across the border.

The English Quakers have not a single insane asylum, but under the milder name of "retreats," they have made excellent provision for such members of their community as require the care of others from any incompetency to take care of themselves; and it is said that the proportion of this class is larger among them than in any other religious denomination — a circumstance which some have attributed to their renunciation of music and

other social diversions which tend to the preservation of mental health.

John Bright is a Quaker, though his Quakerism is an easy fit. He does not appear in the broad brim, or employ the Quaker dialect, at least in his place in Parliament and in the great popular assemblies which he so frequently addresses. In his general character he represents pretty fairly the sentiments of his own religious communion. Intensely democratic, in favor of temperance, universal education and universal suffrage; opposed to slavery, capital punishment, state church and hereditary aristocracy, he is a firm believer in a millennium, moral and political, to be realized when the masses shall be supreme, and "lords and kings shall be no more."

The Baptists hold a strong position and exert a mighty influence among the great religious bodies in England. They have a history of which any religious denomination might be proud. Such names as Andrew Fuller and Robert Hall and John Foster and Carey and Judson and Havelock and John Bunyan are too large to be monopolized by a denomination, and belong rather to the modern history of Christianity in Great Britain. The Baptists have two members of parliament, one of whom is Sir A. Morton Peto, the great London builder, a man of immense wealth, and of a corresponding munificence; and who shows his munificence by building splendid stone chapels in the great metropolis at an expense of ten thousand pounds sterling, and putting earnest and eloquent preachers of the Gospel into them. These "chapels," as they are modestly called, lift up their massive towers among the proud old churches of London. Their pulpits are filled by men of unction and power; and crowded congregations and flourishing churches, active and untiring in every good work, attest the success of their faithful ministrations.

The first of the series built by Mr. Peto, was Bloomsbury chapel, in the neighborhood of the British Museum. This was some sixteen or seventeen years ago. As soon as it was finished the Rev. William Brock was brought up to London from Norwich, through Mr. Peto's influence, to fill it, which he speedily did, and has continued to preach to full houses ever since. We first knew Mr. Brock in the fine old city of Norwich, where he

was the successor of Kinghorn, the antagonist of Robert Hall in a grand discussion on close communion. Brock's influence was all put forth, and with great earnestness, on the side of open communion, speedily reversing, to a great extent, the condition of things as Kinghorn had left it. His chapel was soon filled to overflowing, and had to be enlarged, but was soon filled to overflowing again, and William Brock became one of the most popular and influential men in Norwich. He holds a high position in London, as an able and attractive preacher and a man of most genial spirit and great Christian heart. He was comparatively slender in form for an Englishman, when we first heard him in Norwich, but he has grown ample in physical proportions, as seems meet for such an ample soul. His voice has lost somewhat of its clarion character, but is still rich and powerful, with a peculiar unction of tone, most happy for a preacher, and singularly suited to melt and persuade. What a mighty power is the human voice ! We once saw a London congregation set all a crying by the exceedingly rich and pathetic tones in which a young candidate for missionary labor related his religious experience, when it was extremely doubtful whether he ever had any religious experience ; for he was afterward rejected and sent away from his post in the missionary field for malpractices.

Spurgeon is a Baptist, if not of "the most straitest sect," at least of sufficient zeal to save his great influence to his denomination. The ordinance of baptism as administered by him in his stupendous meeting house, is no mere simple act of immersion in the Jordan, but an imposing scene, a well arranged drama, with attendants and draperies and circumstances which have far more the appearance of a triumph and ovation than of taking up a cross. But these are very small matters in estimating such a man as Spurgeon. What is he as a preacher ? is the grand point. That all the world goes after him is true ; but what of that ? We are assured by the critics that he is neither learned nor logical, nor an original thinker ; that he has no imagination, no brilliancy, no refinement of soul, nor elegance of style nor gracefulness of manner ; that he is gross in appearance, vulgar in his illustrations, and utterly intolerable in his egotism. What one good thing has he then ? Why simply a certain plain way of preaching the old gospel of Bunyan and

Baxter and Paul, which has built the largest house to preach in ever built in London, and keeps it crowded every Sabbath, leaving a great multitude outside; and which has so far answered God's idea of a preacher that the Holy Ghost has borne constant witness in the conversion of large numbers to Christ, of all ages and descriptions; and which has caused his sermons to be published and republished, volume after volume, wherever the English language is spoken, and so universally read that it is very dangerous for a man who preaches borrowed sermons to borrow one of Spurgeon's.

Spurgeon is not a man cultivated in the schools, never went to college, was a plain country schoolmaster, who first exhibited his peculiar gifts in talking to a Sunday school and a simple village audience. What then? Shall we conclude that our schools and colleges and theological seminaries are of less value than we have supposed? Not at all. If Charles Haddon Spurgeon had all the severe cultivation of Harvard and Andover he would turn all to good account, and add immensely to his power as a pulpit orator. But Spurgeon is severely cultivated, has been cultivating himself constantly and intensely ever since he began to excite attention by his oratory. He is cultivated and is cultivating himself every day as an expounder and preacher of God's word; and his grand success is as much the legitimate result of severe and incessant self-discipline as it is of his singular natural powers. He is simply proving that for the great purposes of the Christian ministry a preacher is better than a classic, a logician, a Hebraist, a learned professor, a theologian according to the schools. The grand defect in all our training institutions for men whose professions will require them to address public audiences, is that they make almost no provision for the cultivation of the gift of oratory. It is assumed that if a man has natural powers of eloquence he will be sure to manifest them without any special training in that particular direction, while, if he has not, no training will avail. A greater mistake than is involved in the former part of this proposition there could not possibly be. How is it that we are continually referring to Demosthenes without laying hold of the great lesson which the history of Demosthenes teaches, namely, that a man may have great powers of oratory which never will and

never can be made available without great labor in training? The thing required is not a system under which all shall be formed after one model—destroying individuality and force and producing affectation and mannerism, or an eloquence, however ornate, yet artificial and cold; but a system which shall educate just that which each man possesses as a natural endowment: or, better still, which shall stimulate and guide every man to discipline and develop himself, for every man is mainly self-taught and self-made, and this will be found true just in proportion as his instructors are skilful and qualified for their work. And the result of the largest and severest training will be that the man will come back to the truest simplicity and naturalness, having perfect control of his voice, his thoughts, his subject, himself; and then yielding himself, unshackled and free, to his argument, his emotions, his audience, with never a thought of voice, gesture, or style, leaving all that to take care of itself.

To a considerable extent the English Baptists are in favor of open communion, and thus the way is prepared for co-operation with the Independents in religious matters. It is no uncommon thing to see both united under the same pastor in church fellowship. The Bunyan church at Bedford has had a Congregationalist for its pastor for the last fifteen years. The church is composed of both denominations. A popular Baptist minister in London a few years ago had a large number of Independents in his usual Sabbath congregation, and also in his church, under the name of "occasional members." It is a thing of constant occurrence for Independent churches to receive Baptists in the same way. Such membership includes all privileges except voting. One of the largest and most flourishing Independent churches in London had for many years a decided Baptist for its most beloved and active deacon. The *Eclectic Review* is the joint organ of the two denominations, and under the editorial direction of each in turn, as it may happen. The London *Patriot* newspaper is also a joint concern, or used to be, its editor being supplied by one denomination, and its sub-editor by the other. In all public religious exercises, except those which are connected with the peculiar observances of each, they constantly unite, and in their views of ecclesiastical polity are perfectly

agreed and occupy precisely the same ground in relation to the Established church. The Baptists have less aggregate strength than the Independents, in numbers, intelligence, distinguished men, and general influence. But considered as religious bodies relatively to other religious bodies in England, their views, aims and modes of action are substantially the same. Together they constitute mainly what are usually called "The Religious Dissenters." Our remarks will therefore be applicable in about an equal degree to both Baptists and Independents.

In their principles of church government the dissenters are at antipodes with the Establishment, the affairs of each church being managed entirely by its own members, and each church holding itself to be entirely independent of every other in all matters whatsoever. Synods and Councils in every shape they utterly abjure, professing to see in them distinctly the vital germ of diocesan Episcopacy, with all the manifold evils of prelatical assumption, if not the papacy itself. A preaching shoemaker or tailor or draper, with no license except the approval of the church of which he is a member, (and there are thousands of such among the dissenters) is fully competent to discharge all the offices of the Christian ministry, including the administration of the Lord's Supper. A church invites a man to become its pastor, and the call is accepted. Though a student fresh from the theological college, where, possibly, he has spent no more than one or two years, he may enter at once upon the discharge of his duties, and may go on for half a century without ordination, the approbation of the church to which he ministers being considered valid Scriptural sanction to all intents and purposes. In most instances, however, a public service is held, to which the neighboring ministers are invited, with some distinguished preacher from London or other city of renown, to give the charge to the pastor — that being the principal part, occupying most time, and taking the place of the sermon with us. There is no council and no examination of the candidate, except three or four questions which have been sent to him beforehand by a minister designated for that purpose, and now read to him from the pulpit and answered from manuscript. These questions will probably be, 1. His religious experience; 2. His reasons for entering the ministry; 3. His doctrinal belief; and 4. His

plans for the exercise of his ministry. This is a part of the public services in the great congregation; no second person is permitted to ask a question, and the ministerial brother to whom this duty has been assigned may not go beyond what is written. Do they not believe in creeds then? Most certainly they do; and, inasmuch as they have no councils to look after the matter, the churches reckon this their duty, and guard the purity of Christian doctrine with a most watchful and jealous care.

They care very little about old and new school; they are impatient of speculation and metaphysics and subtle philosophical distinctions in the pulpit; but they look for the Gospel, simply and earnestly presented. If they miss the great doctrines of the Bible—human sinfulness and its desert, the law of God and its obligation, the atonement, God's electing love, the Holy Spirit in regeneration, justification by faith and the perseverance of the saints, they take the alarm and make their voice heard. It requires peculiar gifts of eloquence to enable a preacher with doctrinal deficiencies to pass the ordeal of probation and reach the day of recognition. Has not the time already come when the churches of New England must use their utmost vigilance in reference to this matter of Scriptural soundness in the ministry, and rely less on councils than they have done? Has it not always been the ministers, and not the churches, that have led the way, first in diminishing sound doctrine, and then in disparaging and dispensing with creeds?

Such a religious service as we have described is regarded as a thing of order, rather than of validity, and is generally called "recognition." One of the greatest living preachers in London, Thomas Binney, refused to submit to the imposition of hands at his own recognition, because he thought it savored of apostolical assumption. His example has been very frequently followed by young ministers.

When a minister decides to bring his pastoral relation to a close, he sends a letter of resignation to the church, which is accepted, and the connection is sundered without any intervention of councils.

It would be a great mistake to suppose that their form of church government is the thing of chief importance in the estimation of the English dissenters. That place belongs rather

to the notion which they entertain touching the entire separation of the church from the state, in all possible or conceivable forms. In that connection they see, or think they do, the fruitful source and almost sole origin of all the multiplied evils by which the glory of Christianity is tarnished, its power crippled and its universal triumph delayed. They are very prone to believe, on the other hand, that the dissolution of that connection would be followed by the general prevalence of Christian union, a spiritual and earnest ministry, and a high order of personal piety — that it might even be the harbinger of the millennium. They object to the appointment of a fast-day or a day of thanksgiving by the civil power, and deny the right of the government to interfere at all in the matter of popular education; believing that all these things ought to be left to the action of the people themselves, and that when so left they are sure to be better attended to. Their conduct is in full harmony with their theories in these things; so that, however you may differ with their conclusions, you will find it impossible to withhold your high respect. The dissenters wield a mighty power in England, and statesmen of every party are compelled to treat them with consideration.

ARTICLE VII.

SHORT SERMONS.

“All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets.”—*Matt.* vii. 12.

THE efforts of the Redeemer for the good of our race were directed not so much to the treatment of individual cases, as to the introduction of great principles that lie at the basis of all radical and permanent reforms. These principles are adapted to remove the individual, social or national evils that may exist in any age or nation; and they are simple and easily understood and applied.

The text is the announcement of one of them, as a universal rule of moral obligation, and covering the whole range of moral conduct. It presupposes the existence of certain universal moral relations.

1. Our first remark, therefore, is that these relations must be as universal as the duty imposed. (a) The relations of subjects of the universal moral government of God. This refers to all primary moral obligations. (b) The relations of one common and universal brotherhood. This includes all civil, social and domestic relations.

2. The obligations that these relations impose are ; (a) The duty to render perfect and permanent obedience to God. This includes the perfect service of a perfect constitution. (b) The obligation to observe all the personal rights and privileges of all mankind. These are common to the race and similar in their nature, resulting from the fact that all are alike subjects of one moral government and have a common destiny of endless existence.

Inferences.

1. The moral obligations of man are based on the moral government of God, and hence are universal and permanent.

2. The essential rights of all men are of a moral nature and equal, such as the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

3. The positive authority of civil government is of a moral nature, connected with a moral constitution, and is to be used to sustain the rights of mankind agreeably to that constitution.

4. All true moral and social reforms must recognize and rest upon the moral law of God.

5. The obligation of every man to seek the good of his fellow-men is imperative.

"A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches."—*Prov.* xxii. 1.

A GOOD name is a good reputation or character. It is more to be desired than riches as it has more intrinsic worth, more permanency and more power. It is something "to be chosen"; its possession is a matter of election. One may have it or not at his option, since one's character is a home manufacture. In its original import character means a marking, engraving, carving, painting, imprinting, (Greek, *χαρακτήρ, χάρασσω*.) So we say of the man of business, pleasure, passion, or Christian activities, he is a marked man. But he has done his own marking, engraving.

1. Our first remark therefore is, that every man engraves and imprints his own character. The blank space reserved for him on the canvas of public opinion he fills with his own hand.

2. This is done by his little daily acts, like the little impressions of the pencil, crayon, or chisel of the artist.

3. Then one's real character must be known. For his own acts transfer him as truly to the engraving or picture, as the rays of light the face in the photograph. The engraving is by himself and of himself and so true to himself. So concealment of character for any great length of time is impossible.

4. Then the formation of our character is spontaneous, involuntary, necessary. It is but the impression made by our acts while we are quite forgetful about forming a character; as we get the best picture when he sitting for it is diverted from the process and purpose.

Inferences.

1. It is folly to pretend to be what we are not. For reality is stronger than pretence, and in the run of time will engrave deeper.

2. Explanation of conduct and character is of little use. Every man's life is his best interpreter. If men doubt they will read the context.

3. There can be but little just ground for complaining of the public judgment of us. What we are is what we have done; our acts have sketched our portrait, chiselled out our statue, or impressed our photograph. If the public see warts, deficiencies and graceless lines, they are probably true to nature.

ARTICLE VIII.

LITERARY NOTICES.

The Miracles of Christ as attested by the Evangelists. By ALVAN HOVEY, D.D., Professor in the Newton Theological Institution. pp. 319. Boston: Graves & Young. 1864.

PROF. HOVEY has done well in turning attention to the study of the Miracles of Our Lord. As one of the foundation stones in evidence for our common Christianity, they can not be too often examined. A brief introduction to the volume disposes of three of the common objections to miracles: that there have been many spurious miracles; that they are inconsistent with the observed uniformity of nature; and that the laws of nature are divine, and therefore we

may not suppose God would repudiate his own institutions by disturbing them.

We think this part of the volume could have been profitably enlarged by 'speaking of the possibility and probability of miracles and by replying to some other popular and traditional objections. The power of the miraculous evidence for Christianity is becoming weakened among the unthinking masses by the pretensions of certain modern sciences, so called, and by the intrigues of pretenders to occult powers and the working of wonders. New investigations of the miracles should follow up these new impositions, *pari passu*. Answers to old objections will not meet the new phases of scepticism, and so we think the volume, already excellent, would have been more valuable if it had been cast in a more argumentative form to meet modern exigencies in the popular mind. The author most happily harmonizes the narratives of the same miracles given by the different Evangelists. His criticisms on such men as Strauss and Paulus are clear, terse and conclusive. The whole and strong impression of the work is that God has miraculously attested the divine origin of Christianity and the Christian Scriptures.

Intellectual Philosophy; Analytical, Synthetical and Practical. By HUBBARD WINSLOW, D.D., author of "Moral Philosophy," etc. Eighth edition. 12mo. pp. 442. Boston: Brewer & Tileston. 1863.

THIS work is adapted in style and general arrangement for a textbook in our higher schools; and that it has reached its eighth edition is good proof of its worth. Dr. Winslow has a clear and direct style, and as an author and teacher of repute he is well fitted to write on a topic not very attractive to youthful minds. In this volume he gives a very good outline of the history of philosophy, and notices of leading authors in it, and of their principal systems. Marking the distinction between vegetable and animal life, and between instinct and reason, he classifies and analyzes the mental powers in a happy manner.

The chapters on "Abnormal Mental States" have a peculiar interest, and partly from the new illustrations that the author has drawn from his own observations. We now refer to the chapters on Insanity, Mesmerism, Suspended Animation and Trance. The volume closes with a good summary view of the leading philosophical schools. What specially pleases us is the indirect and unobtrusive yet pertinent infusion of a proper religious thought through the book. Dr. Winslow has neither clouded nor ignored Christianity in his Philosophy.

Life of Archbishop Laud. By JOHN W. NORTON, Rector of Ascension Church, Frankfort, Ky., author of "Full Proof of the Ministry," "Short Sermons," "Life of Bishop Chase," etc. 16mo. pp. 269. E. P. Dutton & Co: Boston. 1864.

WE admire the contrast as seen in issuing the life of this Archbishop in the city of the Puritans, the first ever published in America. Thanks to puritan innovation, it can be done. The mechanical execution is in Houghton's best style. The author carries an easy, graceful pen, and from his high church point has given the Archbishop a good portrait. The one fronting the title page, after Vandyck, is very good. As Boswells and Partons are mournfully scarce we, on the whole, like a thoroughly friendly partizan Memoir. A digest of this one with Neal's outlines of the prelate in his History of the Puritans will give a fair average. Undoubtedly Archbishop Laud has been much sinned against historically. Later Puritans have judged him too much as later churchmen have judged the Puritans of his day, that is, without sufficient allowance for the times when they lived. We can both gain in truth by revising our views. Mr. Norton gives Laud due credit for his eminent learning, the great service he did to Oxford as chancellor, his integrity, zeal as a churchman, and his intense energy, repressing the innovations and excesses of the Puritans. Due regrets are also expressed for his activity in state affairs, though to us quite natural in a church and state system. Mr. Norton glides too easily over the Archbishop's spirit and bearing toward the Puritans, his high tone and overbearing in ecclesiastical courts, his energy in the Star Chamber, his papal predilections and the like. His severe terms, characterizing the Puritans and puritanism, are not in good taste, nor have they an historical accuracy where only the so devout written prayers of the Archbishop are set forth as characterizing the church party.

We have deeply enjoyed the reading of the book, partly because the cause is overdone and undone against the Puritans, and partly because the author makes it so easy for us to put in a stout historical negative occasionally against his declarations. It is no fidelity to history or aid to his one noble branch of Christ's church, to praise William Laud of Reading, by slurring the clerical founders of New England, of whom Hubbard and Higginson speak as "men of great renown in the nation from whence the Laudian persecution exiled them. Their learning, their holiness, their gravity, struck all men that knew them, with admiration. They were Timothy's in their houses, Chrysostoms in their pulpits, and Augustines in their disputations." And the attempt, here and there in Mr. Norton's book, to connect modern

Puritanism with its excesses and excrescences in those early days is no more ingenuous than it would be to attempt to connect modern and New England Episcopacy with the extremes and outrages of Laudian high churchism. Here is a leading deficiency of the book. In its bearing it much ignores the lapse and the modification of two centuries in the history of Puritanism. The tone of the work savors too much of the days of Charles the First, in prelatical assumption. Such writers as Mr. Norton, issuing their publications in this puritan city, should remember the reply of the late Rev. W. M. Rogers to an Episcopal acquaintance of ours, who was somewhat assuming on his connection with the church of Laud, and presumed connection with the church of St. Peter, and so slurred our New England churches: "Sir, you forget that in this country we are the Established church and you are the dissenters."

We like the book, as having a positive and a negative side, and if indicative of the ecclesiasticism and tone of any party in this branch of the church, we wish it may be extensively read, yet for historical purposes we would suggest that at the same time the reader peruse the Lives and Times of Laud's contemporaries and counter-workers, Thomas Goodwin, John Owen, and John Howe.

Christianity the Religion of Nature. Lectures delivered before the Lowell Institute, by A. P. PEABODY, D.D., LL.D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 59 Washington street; New York: Sheldon & Co.; Cincinnati: Geo. S. Blanchard. 1864. pp. 256.

THE able author of this attractive volume sets out with the conviction that the controversy between those who admit and those who deny a special authoritative revelation through Jesus Christ, is now to be waged on grounds of *a priori* probability. Hence his effort is to demonstrate that the religion of the Gospel is in all its parts, in all its apparatus, in all its history, natural religion.

From the necessary definition of religion, Dr. Peabody shows that there can be but one religion. The distinction between natural and revealed religion is defined to consist in the different methods in which religious truth becomes known to mankind; and both are regarded alike natural. Revelation is the unveiling of what previously existed. Hence revelation is a historical fact that was to be expected from the nature of God and the wants of man. Here the remarkable passage in one of Plato's dialogues, put into the mouth of one of the disciples of Socrates, is used with much power as showing the cravings of man's nature for something more sure and safe than reason, "such as some divine communication would be."

Dr. Peabody contends boldly for authoritative revelation con-

firmed by miracle; and that miracles belong to the religion of nature. He affirms that miracles are a "demand of human nature, because man is spirit as well as body, and gravitates toward the unseen future," craving "that the barrier between the material and the spiritual be at some point ruptured." Furthermore, each separate creative act of the Almighty is a miracle; and so the natural world is full of miracles. We are glad to see the distinction clearly made that, while the *fact* of revelation is in accord with nature, the *contents* of revelation must be in great part such as could not have been anticipated on the natural grounds; and also that the faculties which are inadequate for the *discovery* of truth may be amply sufficient for the attestation of it after it is discovered.

But we are extremely sorry to find the gravest errors broached in the carrying out of an argument so well begun. When Dr. Peabody comes to speak of probation as extending to the life to come, and of sinless generations yet to come in this world by the reclaiming process of religion, we are compelled to differ from him *toto cælo*. We are amazed that so great a mind in working upwards towards the Gospel system should go so far on the right way, and then stop short and turn round, and reeling, fall over the precipice. Even Starr King admitted that if revelation and its facts be taken as real, a day of judgment upon the deeds and character of this life, with eternal punishment, could not be rejected. That we are not misrepresenting Dr. Peabody, we make the following quotations from pages 111, 112 and 113:

"I grant that, if this life be regarded as a period of probation and the only period for all men, as it is a probationary state and may be the only one for the fully privileged, the condition of the unprivileged would be irreconcilable with the Divine love. But, so far as these last are concerned, is it not reasonable to suppose this world simply a birthplace and conservatory of spirits that are to be trained and nurtured elsewhere?"

"Now the thronging ranks of the unprivileged can be compared only to these closely crowded trees planted on purpose to be transplanted. They do not get their moral training here. They do not get their moral training here. They do not fairly make their election between good and evil. They know so little of moral distinctions, that the wrong which they seem to choose is in no sense the choice of the soul, and may not unfitly be regarded as a mere habitude of the body."

"And when all the world shall have been all reclaimed, when the nursery shall all be fruitful orchard-ground, there will have been created in the veins of humanity, to be transmitted to sinless generations, and to be translated to its ultimate higher sphere of being, a vastly nobler, harder, more energetic type of moral and spiritual character than could have come into existence, had the plan of Providence been that of equal privilege for all and always."

We commend the author to Professor Shedd's sermon on "The Guilt of the Pagan," published in the *National Preacher* for September last, in which it is demonstrated that if the light concerning God and the moral law, however small it be, in the intellect of any man in Pagan or Christian lands, is yet actually in advance of the inclination and affections of his heart, and the actions of his life, he deserves to be punished in proportion to his light, like any and every other creature under the Divine government, of whom the same thing is true.

From the quotation above it is easy to see how very defective Dr. Peabody's views must be in regard to several fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, such as distributive justice, the natural character of man, regeneration, atonement, etc. In the eighth chapter, entitled *The Holiness of God—God in Christ*, the most erroneous teachings and reasonings crop out on all these subjects. The proper divinity of Christ and vicarious expiatory atonement are substantially repudiated, and in one place he seems to represent the imprecatory Psalms as the result of the Jewish limited knowledge of the Supreme Being. And also, that from the same cause arose their idea of sacrifice. "Their God was the Sovereign, but not the Universal Father. He was angry, and needed to be appeased by sacrifice." How far does all this fall short of repudiating his own argument for authoritative revelation?

Poems. By JEAN INGELOW. pp. 256. 16mo. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1864.

OUR curiosity and admiration have been excited of late by the appearance in various public prints, of dainty first-fruits of song, over the signature of Jean Ingelow, bearing unmistakably the imprint of genius, and betokening an abundant harvest, into whose storehouse we have longed to penetrate. Our wish has at length been gratified, and we desire to share with our readers the good things we have found. We regret that of our author we know only that she is an Englishwoman, whose productions have obtained no notoriety in her own country till the year of their republication here.

The subjects which Miss Ingelow treats are mostly from daily life; but her poems are not therefore trite or commonplace. By their freshness, their fulness of life, their freedom from constraint, they captivate us at once, and seem to deprecate criticism as the song of a bird mocks the strict canons of the *Conservatoire*. Yet on looking more closely, we find evidence of thought and study, only concealed by the perfect naturalness of expression which at first attracts us. But as to the matter of criticism in general; we should much prefer,

with kindly Kit North, "lang, lang extracts," on which each reader might pass his own verdict, to the anatomical process in vogue. It is easy to say a writer cannot do this or that as well as another, but we hold such comparisons as ungracious among authors as among friends. Each, if he has a right to either sacred name, has his own peculiar characteristics, which constitutes his charm. Were he quite like any one else whom we esteem, his attraction for us would not be complete.

Miss Ingelow's chief failing seems to be a want of clearness, an involved sequence of thought, which in her longer poems makes her meaning sometimes obscure. She has not yet quite learned to proportion her poems; yet so charming are her digressions, and apt her illustrations, that one finds it difficult to complain of the length of either. A little song intercalated, in Tennysonian fashion, in a more serious poem, is a good illustration:

"Coo, dove, to thy married mate,
She has two warm eggs in her nest,
Tell her the hours are few to wait
Ere life shall dawn on their rest;
And thy young shall peck at the shells, elate
With a dream of her brooding breast.

"Coo, dove, for she counts the hours,
Her fair wings ache for flight:
By day the apple has grown in the flowers,
And the moon has grown by night.
And the white drift settled from hawthorn bowers,
Yet they will not seek the light.

"Coo, dove, but what of the sky?
And what if the storm-wind swell,
And the reeling branch come down from on high
To the grass where daisies dwell,
And the brood beloved should with them lie
Or ever they break the shell.

"Coo, dove; and yet black clouds lower
Like fate, on the far-off sea,
Thunder and wind they bear to thy bower
As on wings of destiny.
Ah, what if they break in an evil hour,
As they broke over mine and me!" pp. 194—5.

We are often reminded of Tennyson in reading these poems, not by any appearance of imitation, though we should imagine that Tennyson had had a strong influence upon Miss Ingelow's mind, but rather from a native similarity of thought and feeling and philosophic

tendency. She resembles him especially in her felicitous manner of treating things divine. There is no flippancy, no irreverent familiarity, no pious platitude in her writings; their piety is humble and heartfelt; they teach, we cannot help feeling, more lessons than the author thought. Take an example from the "Scholar and Carpenter," a poem full of beauties:

"Dread is the leisure up above
The while He sits whose name is Love,
And waits as Noah did, for the dove,
To wit if she would fly to him.

"He waits for us, while, houseless things,
We beat about with bruised wings
On the dark floods and water-springs
The ruined world, the desolate sea.
With open windows from the prime
All night, all day, he waits sublime,
Until the fulness of the time
Decreed from His eternity."

We have a strong desire for room to insert entire, "Supper at the Mill," pp. 49—59. It has a rare richness of heart in it, as well as true poetic genius in conception and expression. It is a passage in the "annals of the poor," that any heart may be envied for its ability to write. It is a homely scene, beautifully sketched, just as gifted painters sometimes choose a broken gate, a tumble-down cottage, or a ragged child for the most gifted services of their pencil.

This beautiful and rich volume goes forth, as is becoming, in the best style of the Riverside press.

We are glad to learn that another volume of Miss Ingelow's poems is already announced in England, yet we trust, in the words of a friendly critic, "that the new favorite will not be beguiled into hasty and imperfect productions." She can well afford to let her genius ripen; her place will be kept for her, and then, we venture to predict, kept by her permanently and nobly. Her rare powers of perception and expression, as seen in the first volume, promise the best things for herself and her readers. She is already gaining an appreciative patronage on this side the water; the entire first edition of poems being sold in Boston on the day of publication.

Biography of Self-Taught Men. With an Introductory Essay. By B. B. EDWARDS. Boston: J. E. Tilton & Co.

THE name of the lamented B. B. Edwards is commendation enough for this elegant volume. He was one of the finest scholars and most beautiful characters that New England has produced. We

remember to have read the book with intense interest when it was first published, and have still our copy of the first edition.

The Introductory Essay is full of broad, Christian views in relation to our country and its great needs — some of which are peculiarly pertinent and valuable at the present time. The Biographical Sketches embrace a wide range and are well fitted to stimulate and encourage young men to make the most of themselves. They will read the book wrong, however, if they think the way to do this is to dispense with any educational advantages within their reach.

Excursions. By HENRY D. THOREAU, author of "Walden," and "A Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers." Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1863.

THE author of these interesting papers was an original, not to say a genius. He graduated at Harvard without distinction, and then went his way through the world, loving intensely all that was simple and beautiful — trees, birds, flowers, rivers, mountains, clouds. He preferred walking to riding because he could better prosecute his acquaintance with the natural world. He made no use of wine, spirits or tobacco, because he did not like them, and was extremely simple in manners, dress, and food. The country was his paradise, while he eschewed the city, and thanked God that the builders of cities and levelers of forests could not "cut down the clouds."

The essays, as might be expected, are genial and sparkling, abounding with exquisite pictures from nature. They are not written from a Christian point of view, and ignore the great fact that man has more reason to be thoughtful and sad than crickets and birds.

Snow Flakes; A Chapter from the Book of Nature. pp. 146. Published by the American Tract Society. No. 28 Cornhill, Boston.

A BEAUTIFUL volume and just in time. This snow field is a new field of literature, almost untrodden, and the editor of this delightful miscellany is in it early. The illustrations of the various forms of the snow crystal are exquisite, nearly two hundred of them, thrown in white on a blue ground. The vast variety as well as most delicate structure of snow flakes, is marvellous to those who have never studied them under the microscope. We look in vain among these facsimiles before us for one peculiar crystal of the snow-flake, so penetrating, so deleterious to health and so much dreaded by good people — we mean the Sabbath snow-flake. These Snow-Flakes of the Tract Society are imbedded in a rich selection of prose and poetry. The entire book is a delight.

ARTICLE IX.

THE ROUND TABLE.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS.—Much has been said on the question of our publishing the names of our Writers in connection with their contributions. The question has two sides, and many things can be said on both. It would be gratifying to us personally, and complimentary to the *Review* to publish them, for it is a worthy list. With the close of the third volume we numbered more than forty writers of leading articles, and in our fourth volume we shall add many to this number. We already include contributors to our prominent Quarterlies and Monthlies. But we think we favor most the fair and full discussion of many topics, and send forth the discussions in the best hope of a candid judgment on them, to withhold the names of the authors. It leaves the articles to be read without preference or prejudice, to be judged on their own merits, and to carry an influence according to their own inherent worth.

THE WAR.—We enter again on our pages our hearty endorsement of "the powers that be" in the struggle to suppress the rebellion and sustain the government. Should we prove recreant or fail in this, we should be ashamed to die and go to our revolutionary fathers. It is with a thankful heart, as the year closes upon us, that we are able to make so happy a record of our progress in suppressing the huge national semi-organized mob. There is a majesty, an awful sublimity in that steady, irresistible pressure with which we are crowding, compressing and crushing the outbreak. The movement of our armies is like those vast ice floes of the Arctic of which Dr. Kane speaks, extending for hundreds of miles. To a careless observer there appears to be little motion or force, but woe to the object that stands in their way, or lies between them when their grinding edges come together. We see vast progress, and we have nothing but the fullest confidence in the success of our arms, and we think we can see almost to the end of battles. Then will arise questions for the profoundest statesmanship.

UNION AMONG CONGREGATIONALISTS.—Next to truth and purity, the Congregational denomination should labor to promote *union* above everything. We need union among ourselves far more than union with other evangelical denominations. We cannot enjoy the

peculiar excellences and advantages of our free and liberal form of polity without the constant danger of controversy and division. Hence it is the more important that charity and harmony be sedulously cultivated. We are to be bound together, not so much by bonds of government as by the cement of grace. If this becomes chilled and frost-bitten the whole frame breaks, crumbles and falls to pieces.

We need union among ourselves, and there is a firm, broad, basis on which it may be built and maintained, which it is the object of this *Review* to define and establish. That basis is kind, conciliatory, but careful and firm adherence to the substance of clearly revealed truth. It supports neither extreme. It is the high beaten road of those great positive truths which the church have found by experience to be in the highest degree promotive of piety. It turns not to the right to countenance any blind or obstinate adherence to narrow schools and fastidious distinctions; nor does it turn to the left to encourage or tolerate the radical changes, the new theories and presumptuous speculations of men claiming peculiar originality. Unity in substantial truth requires limits. The boundaries must somewhere be set. It is only indifference to truth that requires no limits.

It will be found that in a thinking and educated denomination like our own, union cannot be maintained where a high standard of truth is not firmly held, and where novelty and speculation in matters of faith and practice are allowed. The confidence of the right-minded will be shaken. If a company of singers allow some of their number to drop out or change any one of the notes of the scale, how soon trouble must arise. The careless singers, the lovers of noise may not be troubled. But the true lovers of music will be pained. Cultivated ears cannot tolerate the discords. Some simple tunes might be enjoyed, and for certain occasions and purposes they would be well. But not so for the main purposes of organization. The most valuable members will remonstrate earnestly for awhile; but they are not the kind that contend long, or clamor until they are heard. Tell us not that the way to broad and firm union lies in dropping, or being indifferent to a part of the notes, even those of the chromatic scale. Union is promoted only by adhering to the fixed laws of music. True, extreme taste, fastidiousness should not be allowed to divide on the one hand, nor neglect of the distinctions of the human ear on the other.

So is it in the system of the Gospel. The leading truths and distinctions are just as marked and just as inexorable as are the tones and semitones in the musical scale. The union of a denomination

can only be promoted by a common love of, and adherence to these divinely constituted distinctions. Undoubtedly there must be theological controversy. Our rights in the truth must be maintained, as in most other interests, by opposition to invaders. The many and diametrically opposite sects in doctrine make controversy as necessary as it is inevitable.

But while every sect feels compelled to it, each controversialist may and should set limits and a tone to his own action that he will sacredly preserve. Minor points of difference may and should be held much in abeyance for the sake of the greater good of a general unity. The broad Evangelical church has now enough of common interest under a common Master to make light of any internal divisions that lie somewhat in a different use of terms, and somewhat in a philosophical spirit that has risen up in the place of the Evangelists. It is perfectly proper to like just thirty-nine articles of faith, or one hundred and seven, or either of these two sets with the addition of a residence "in Ænon near to Salem." Yet while that held in common by all evangelical men is immeasurably more than that in which they differ, how eminently Christian that they make the less yield to the greater, and count it all as worthless for Christ's sake. Schools of philosophy have an important place, and they should confine themselves to it rather than institute schools in an Evangelical church. In the philosophy of our religion the profoundest, nicest distinctions should be made, but not in our religion itself. The former belongs to scholars, the latter to the people. These want what they need, religion. Those are set apart from the people to philosophize, analyze and synthesize, in the regions of the obscure.

The proper limits of religious controversy being observed, it is productive of good in proportion as its spirit is good. A cordial, genial controversy, full of fairness and gentleness, with a broad margin for mutual misunderstanding, a quick and appreciative perception of points of agreement, and a motive above all others that Christ and his Gospel may be honored, is one of the highest exercises of a Christian scholar. And the Evangelical church, that in the absence of revivals and in the presence of the war has become somewhat at variance within itself, needs much to be baptized with and bathed in the spirit of him who did "not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street," and who gave his back to the smiters and his cheeks to them that plucked off the hair, while he went quietly forward with the great work of saving men.

CRITICS AND CRITICISM. Who should know the intention* of any craft better than those initiated into its mysteries? And, knowing so many piquant things, it would be asking too much of human nature to expect the men of the quill to tell no tales out of school. On the whole, the critical art does not seem to suffer much through these disclosures of the weaknesses of its professors. One may be vexed at the collisions, and amused at the blunders, of the literary Rhadamanthuses; yet there is a singular power in judgments about books when dignified with types and printer's ink. And few are the authors or readers who are not more or less influenced in their feelings by the editorial verdicts, whether more or less elaborate, of the managers of the periodical press, albeit the satire of the poet may be oftener true than said managers might like to admit:

“ Like trout pursued, the critic in despair,
Darts to the mud, and finds his safety there.”

Professor Craik thinks that contemporary writers are hardly the proper subjects of the labors of the critical profession, as being too near in point of view for a correct estimate. One would be apt to extend to more than these the benefit of this opinion, remembering how saucily and savagely many famous wits have treated each others' productions. Cowley the artificial made sport of Chaucer the simple child of nature. Marivaux the exquisite despised the easy familiarities of Moliere. Fielding never had done laughing at Richardson's faultless proprieties of sentiment and expression; while the author of *Sir Charles Grandison* was sure that his rival's fame would be only another rocket. Johnson could see no merit in Gray's elaborate letters, and allowed his royalist narrowness to eclipse the radiance of Milton's great glory. Corneille is said to have advised Racine not to write tragedy after the appearance of one of the latter's noble dramas: and Fontenelle told Voltaire that he had no dramatic talent, when the *Brutus* of this versatile author was brought out in Paris. Johnson once said (his bile must have been badly disturbed) that he would hang a dog that read the *Lycidas* of Milton twice. Everyone knows how long it took to teach the world that there was any special merit in the *Paradise Lost*. And the Vicar of Wakefield never had much success till Lord Holland, recovering from illness, read it accidentally, and commended it to his friends. So people differ. It is indeed difficult to account for these conflicting conclusions. One is almost ready to doubt if the critics have any better standard of judgment than Malherbe, who measured prose authorship by its effect in reducing the price of bread, and regarded a poet of the first class as no more to be lauded than a skilful player at ninepins.

It might be a question whether natural good sense and mother wit are not about as reliable judges of authorial excellence as that sort of bookish culture which is ordinarily relied on as a test of literary compositions. When Thomson's *Seasons* first came out, a Scottish laird handed a copy of it to his gardener, who at once discerned the genius which inspired its descriptions of nature, and pronounced it "a grand book." We would stake such a judgment against even the leviathan Rambler's dictum that if every other line of the "*Seasons*" were left out, the poem would be as good as it now is; that is, good for nothing, of course. This is a fine anecdote told concerning Burns' *Cotter's Saturday Night*. A lady who much admired and kindly befriended the poet, had an old housekeeper to whom she, on a time, showed that perfect poem. When the mistress, a while after, asked the servant her opinion of the poem, she replied: "A weel, madam, that's vera weel." "Is that all you have to say in its favor?" asked the mistress. "'Deed, madam," she answered, "the like of your quality may see a vast deal in it; but I was aye used to the like o' all that the poet has written about in my ain father's house, and at weel I dinna ken how he could have described it any other gate." That criticism was worth more than praise from the Edinburgh professor of belles lettres. Burns used to say that it was one of the highest compliments he ever received.

Critics and authors are not always the best of friends, which is not very surprising. Now and then a libel suit for damages, on account of too sharp a point to the reviewer's pen, diversifies the monotony of the bench and the bar—rather an evidence of weakness in judgment and temper on the part of the flayed book-maker, gathering our conclusion from the history of such appeals to Themis. We should not counsel the Irishman's resort to individual justice, though much more direct and effective undoubtedly. The incident occurs in the memorabilia of Robert Southey. He had severely canterized a volume from the hand of a son of Erin. Soon after, while talking with a friend in a public resort respecting the ambitious Emeraldaler's abortive attempt, the identical author walked into the circle. He was a powerful specimen of his race, and having just read his literary decapitation, was full of wrath. "If he could find the malicious reviewer, he would bate him sure, indade would he," swinging a huge fist unconsciously in perilous nearness to the offender's physiognomy. Southey kept close and dark, not fancying such a settlement of accounts, reserving his laugh over the adventure to a safer moment.

After all, the critics are not so far wrong as disappointed authors are prone to think. If they are justly chargeable with a large

amount of incompetency and unfairness, there is truth enough in the reviewing art as currently followed to make the institution respectable and useful. It is, in fact, a confessed necessity of the republic of letters. Writers who abuse the critics might perhaps profitably recollect an anecdote of an irritated quilldriver who was soundly berating a censor of some of his productions, as "without exception, the most superficial, self-sufficient, ignorant, shallow creature that ever made any pretensions to literature." "Gently, my dear Sir," interrupted a gentleman, "you quite forget yourself."

DENOMINATIONAL ACTIVITY. Our brethren of the Episcopal church are having a revival of this. We hear of them in various prominent and also obscure places, offering and pleading for, their doctrines and polity and forms of worship. Here, like good Nehemiah, they are rebuilding walls that had fallen down, and there, like Paul, they are laying new foundations "in the regions beyond" any church of their order. They are also making a generous offer to take other denominations in, if it be not a bid for them. For, as we understand, they intimate a willingness to throw off some of their peculiar forms of worship, and so constitute a basis on which all evangelical orders can unite. We do not commend the zeal so much when shown in localities where an evangelical faith is supplied in abundance and to popular satisfaction as when expended in places of real destitution. The need of labor in New England for home evangelization is preëminent. We mean that there is a large class, probably one-fourth of our population, who attend on no public worship through sheer indifference or hostility. Some places are wholly destitute of the public and saving means of grace. Any denominational activity that will stir others to preach the gospel to these, while the spirit of ecclesiasticism is kept under, we shall hail as a good omen; and we hope this late and marked and apparently widely concerted labor of our prelatical neighbors will provoke other evangelical denominations to good works in furnishing the means of grace to those who do not now enjoy them. And we hope that none of us will rejoice so much in the increase of churches of "our order" as we shall in the increase of men of Christ's order.